

$\sim$	דא רכ	$D \cap T$	7.7\	т
. D.	AIN	DO7	/ H	. 1

1	THE CLERK: Calendar number two,
2	Edward Green.
3	Appearances.
4	MR. KEITH: Arnold Keith; Hornstein,
5	Palumbo & Keith.
6	MR. BERLAND: Jason Berland for the
7	People.
8	THE COURT: All right, let's do
9	Antommarchie, Sandoval, and any evidentiary
10	things. Let's get on with it.
11	MR. BERLAND: The People provided Counsel
12	with Rosario material. I do have the Rosario list
13	for the Court. Would you like me to begin with
14	Sandoval?
15	MR. KEITH: Before we do that, with
16	regard to the evidentiary ruling, there has been
17	quite a bit of discussion between myself and
18	Mr. Berland with regard to a possible disposition.
19	One of the arguments that's been raised
20	by the People or a part of our discussion was the
21	fact that upon entry to the apartment in question,
22	Mr. Green basically didn't do anything
23	THE COURT: When you say "in question,"
24	meaning the fourth floor?
25	MR. KEITH: The fourth floor apartment.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER —————

2.0

#### SANDOVAL:

THE COURT: Fine. Go ahead.

MR. KEITH: I believe during the Darden hearing, there was some testimony to the effect when the police were trying the keys in the different apartments, when they got up to the apartment that Mr. Green was in, they put the key in, and I believe they indicated that they announced police or words to that effect and indicated they were coming in.

During the process, Mr. Green, in the apartment, did not respond, just sat there, and when they entered, he was just sitting there on the couch.

Your Honor, I believe and I think it's clear that it was perfectly within his right to do that, and that there should be no inference of guilt or consciousness of guilt because of his non-response to the police activity.

THE COURT: What legally do you think I would do or what instruction do you think I would give to the jury? What are you seeking to prevent?

MR. KEITH: I just want it clear to the jury that they should not infer a consciousness of guilt or any guilty behavior because he exercises

SANDOVAL :

his right to do nothing.

2.2

THE COURT: Well, I would not be making any comment at all unless and until we get to the charge conference and somebody asks me to give a consciousness of guilt charge. If there's a request, almost certainly it would be granted, but --

MR. KEITH: I would also --

THE COURT: I would never interrupt the testimony to say, for example, when a police officer would be testifying about a statement, I would never interrupt to say anything about the defendant's right to speak or not to speak. You let the thing go.

My recollection of the testimony, I'm not going to testify and I don't remember, my recollection was your client was supposedly sitting in the dark, not having said anything.

The jury can hear all of that and make their own decision about what, if anything, it means. There's nothing I would say other than to give them a general consciousness of guilt charge, if requested.

MR. KEITH: Well, then I would hope that
Your Honor would direct the People to not argue

YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

	SANDOVAL ————
	SANDOVAL
1	that because if he did that, that's some indicia
2	of guilt.
3	THE COURT: They can argue that. Why
4	wouldn't they be allowed to argue that?
5	MR. KEITH: Because I believe he has a
6	constitutional right to not respond to police
7	officers.
8	THE COURT: You can argue that, but it's
9	in conjunction with everything else the jury will
10	be hearing.
11	MR. KEITH: I don't believe that legally
12	he was obligated to get up and open the door.
13	THE COURT: Nobody is suggesting that he
14	is. I might even, if you ask me, say he is not
15	required to get up and open the door.
16	MR. KEITH: I want the jury to know that.
17	If that's the law, I want the jury to know that.
18	THE COURT: Okay, but don't misunderstand
19	that the jury may still decide something adverse
20	to them. He's sitting in the dark during the day.
21	I don't know that.
22	MR. KEITH: That defeats the whole thing.
23	THE COURT: It doesn't defeat it You

THE COURT: It doesn't defeat it. You want 12 jurors -- whether he, Mr. Berland, can prove the case, part of it is, I see a defendant

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

24

with a bloody knife standing over a dead body.

Part of it in some situations is, I saw the defendant standing over the body before it died. Other situations are rather, I saw a person running down the stairs with a bloody knife in their hand and when I ran upstairs, there is a deceased body with a gaping hole in their throat.

All the varieties of factual testimony that a jury has to analyze is just it. It's their analysis. They're supposed to put common human experience together as part of their factfinding function. It's not for a judge to say what they're supposed to think.

There are certain categories of things where there is a law that says something. That doesn't mean having heard what the law is the jury isn't going to find adverse to whatever either side is hoping that they'll find, but they certainly can hear.

And, again, my recollection is a little bit hazy. Let's assume, as I sort of remember it, some time during the day that Mr. Green was arrested --

Was it during the day?

MR. BERLAND: Late afternoon, early

SANDOVAL:

evening.

2.3

MR. KEITH: November 1, 2007, at 5:20 p.m.

THE COURT: So that can be analyzed both ways, from both side's standpoint. He's tired. He's had a hard day at work. He wants to sit in the quiet room and close his eyes. That's fine. The jury can decide that.

The jury can decide he walked into the room in the dark, didn't know what, if anything, was there, and sat down. That's fine, too.

For you to ask me to say that they can't find something, the 600 or 825 years of law doesn't enable me to do that.

MR. KEITH: I respectfully disagree. I think that if the police officers come banging on your door and you decide to sit there and not do anything, that you are perfectly within your right to do that and there is no consciousness of guilt that should be attached to that. That's the explanation of the law.

THE COURT: You used the word "your." Was it his apartment?

MR. KEITH: I don't think that changes the analysis, the fact that it wasn't his

= SANDOVAL =

1	apartment.
2	THE COURT: As they say in Latin, res
3	ipsa loquitur, the thing speaks for itself. The
4	jury then will get to hear the circumstances under
5	which the people think he got in the apartment,
6	whether it's valid or not and that will be in the
7	mix of what the jury is to factually decide.
8	What other evidentiary thing would you
9	like to discuss?
10	MR. KEITH: I want to make sure we're
11	clear. The People can argue that that action is a
12	consciousness of guilt?
13	THE COURT: Sure. If you think that's an
14	appeal issue
15	MR. KEITH: I am not thinking about an
16	appeal. I am thinking about Mr. Green getting a
17	fair trial.
18	THE COURT: He'll get a fair trial.
19	MR. KEITH: I will have to argue to the
20	jury that he had a right not to do or say
21	anything.
22	THE COURT: I guess. I'm not the defense
23	lawyer. Let me see if I understand the facts.
24	MR. KEITH: Okay.
25	THE COURT: The police find contraband in

SANDOVAL

the room in which he's sitting. Yes or no?

MR. BERLAND: Correct.

MR. KEITH: Yes.

THE COURT: I am not suggesting that you or I were there. They find drugs in the room in which he was sitting?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  KEITH: In a safe in the room -- in a closet in the room.

THE COURT: So the safe is locked, and the jury will then get to decide if the door was locked to the room in which one or two safes with drugs in them are found. Then they get to decide whether or not the lights, I guess, were on or off when the police come through. Then, I guess, they decide whether the police actually said police or said anything, and then, I guess, they decide whether there is an audible sign to an older man across the door as a lock and door are being fiddled with, and then they get to decide whether the police detected any movement or Mr. Green simply was sitting in the dark, literally and figuratively, when they came in.

All of these things are part and parcel, the whole makeup of this case and they vary somewhat, the factual considerations that a jury

SANDOVAL

has to make from literally top to bottom in any case that the jury is asked to decide.

No judge says anything more than that. If you want me to, I will say he's got an absolute right. I'm saying it not knowing what the proof is going to be regarding the word "your."

When you said to me would I tell them that he has an absolute right not to answer a knock or a summons or direction or inquiry by the police, it didn't dawn on me that there was an issue about whose room it was.

We're going to get to the point where we're talking about an instruction to the jury about the legal effects under certain different factual predicates, his non-response, we need to be understanding that it could be that if he has no right to be there, and that's a factual scenario I have to present to them, that might affect what the law is about his right or non-right to say anything.

If he has a right to be there, I'll incorporate that in my instruction I have to give, but we're beating this one to death. You are on notice that it's not exactly the way you hoped it to be and I'm certain that it's not a surprise.

	SANDOVAL
1	MR. KEITH: Well, actually it is.
2	THE COURT: I know, but you get paid,
3	basically, to say it's a surprise, and it may be
4	and if it is, I'm wrong. Let's keep going.
5	MR. KEITH: Again, Your Honor, I'm sorry,
6	but I want to make sure we're clear on this.
7	THE COURT: I'm clear. I don't know about
8	you.
9	MR. KEITH: I know from the prosecutor's
LO	perspective that that's basically the position
L1	that they're taking, some indicia of guilt by
L2	Mr. Green sitting there and doing nothing in this
L3	dark room
L 4	THE COURT: How did they start on this
L5	discussion? You started. You wanted something
L 6	about no consciousness of guilt because he's
L7	sitting there.
L8	MR. KEITH: Your Honor, I strongly
L9	believe that legally that is an erroneous
20	position. I believe this man has a right not do
21	anything.
22	THE COURT: We will flesh out the factual
23	circumstances in accordance with everything I've
ълΙ	anid for the least 22 minutes are Whateres 'I '

said for the last 22 minutes now. Whatever it is, it will be good news for you or bad news for you.

\_\_YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SANDOVAL = If it's good news, he'll be grateful. If it's bad news, nothing you haven't experienced before in your many, many decades of trial work, and you've navigated all of the pitfalls within the trial practice. What's his position on Antommarchie, unless there's some other evidentiary issue that, pardon the expression, we can clear up easily? MR. KEITH: Your Honor, I guess we can

provide you with the Sandoval/Antommarchie.

THE COURT: Then you get to ask him his position on Antommarchie, since that appears to be the simplest of the next things to do.

With regard to the MR. KEITH: Antommarchie rights, I believe I sufficiently explained them to Mr. Green, and he will waive his rights in that regard.

THE COURT: Okay, fine.

Mr. Berland, why don't you do the Sandoval with respect to criminal history if the defendant testifies.

MR. KEITH: Is it possible that Mr. Green could be uncuffed?

THE COURT: Yes, it is. Would you like us to do that?

SANDOVAL : MR. KEITH: Yes, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: They are physically capable 3 of doing that and we will now ask them to do it. 4 MR. KEITH: I will not be that difficult. 5 THE COURT: It's all right. That is in 6 keeping with my persnicketiness. With keeping 7 with the ADA script, when they say, did you have 8 an opportunity to interview the witness, you will 9 likely hear me say, did you take the opportunity. 10 Having it and using it are two distinct things. 11 MR. KEITH: I understand. 12 THE COURT: They apparently don't. I've 13 made that point for no purpose for a long time. 14 What about Sandoval? 15 MR. BERLAND: Your Honor, the defendant, 16 Mr. Green, has a lengthy, lengthy criminal record 17 dating back to the Nixon administration. 18 first felony was in 1969. 19 THE COURT: Not a Federal felony. 20 MR. BERLAND: Not a Federal felony. 21 THE COURT: Nor California. 22 MR. BERLAND: Just New York. 23 THE COURT: Tell me about that. 24 MR. BERLAND: I think for the sake of

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

fairness I want to focus on three felony

SANDOVAL:

convictions. The last one, October 8, 1996 conviction here in New York County when the defendant was convicted of Attempted Criminal Sale of a Controlled Substance in the Third Degree, a class A felony, where along with the co-defendant he sold Ziploc bags of cocaine to an undercover at 160 West 133rd Street. He plead guilty and received three to six years.

The second conviction is a Federal case.

March 24, 1994 was the date of the crime. He did

not plead guilty until July 1, 1996, to 18 U.S.

Code 924(c)(2), and that's Possession of a Firearm

During Drug Trafficking. In that case, and this

occurred in South Carolina, the defendant was

found in possession of a 12-gauge --

THE COURT: A 12 what?

MR. BERLAND: Shotgun. I do not know.

However, based on the information --

THE COURT: You cannot gauge its accuracy.

MR. BERLAND: I cannot gauge how long the barrel was. It was -- we have to assume it was not a violent crime; however, it's still a felony.

The oldest case is an Attempted Kidnapping in the First Degree from August 30,

2.0

2.1

2.3

SANDOVAL

1982. It's a Class B violent felony, where the defendant abducted an individual by the name of Woodrow Sulton (phonetic) with intent to compel Anne Sulton to pay money for the release of Woodrow Sulton.

Because the case was some time ago, not sure of the relationship between the Woodrow Sulton and Anne Sulton. I know the defendant fled to South Carolina after the crime was committed and was arrested seven months later.

MR. BERLAND: Based on these three felony convictions, I believe it goes to the veracity and honesty of the defendant. I think they are substantive, and the jury should hear about them and the underlying facts.

Regarding the attempted kidnapping, when prior convictions are for crimes of dishonesty, usually we think of theft or fraud, the Courts often allow cross-examination of underlying facts.

The kidnapping is of a person. I think that is clearly a crime of dishonesty. Although it is an old case, I think the jury should hear about the crime and some of the facts. That pretty much wraps it up.

SANDOVAL

discussion of his rap sheet?

MR. BERLAND: Correct, in under seven minutes.

THE COURT: Fine. Mr. Keith.

MR. KEITH: Your Honor, I guess I should go to the oldest case first. The kidnapping case is 26 years ago. He received a sentence of two to six on that accusation.

Your Honor, I don't think there's any probative value into going into that crime at all. I ask Your Honor to not mention the fact that there is a felony conviction from 26 years ago.

Mr. Green is now 58 years old. That was a different person and a different lifetime. I don't think that conviction or any reference to that conviction will have any probative value in this case. Clearly, there will be some prejudicial effect if it comes into play.

When you balance the scales, Your Honor should consider not adding any reference to it at all or at the very least to mention the fact that there was a felony conviction from 26 years ago.

THE COURT: What else?

MR. KEITH: With regard to the Federal conviction, Your Honor, he did plead to a Federal

SANDOVAL

weapons charge. I don't believe that charge says possession of a weapon involved with narcotics. I believe it simply says possession of a weapon.

It's fairly routine in Federal Court whether the gun is in the home or place of business, shotgun, rifle, a sentence of seven months is usually the sentence that is imposed in Federal Court.

It's my understanding that this was a shotgun in a home. I don't believe that would be a New York felony. It is what it is. It's a Federal conviction that he received a five-year sentence for.

I would ask Your Honor to just indicate that he had a prior conviction in Federal Court. I don't believe that's the equivalent of a New York felony because of the factual nature of the charge.

Lastly, with regard to the October 8,
1996 conviction for Attempted Criminal Sale of a
Controlled Substance in the Third Degree, in that
case, Mr. Green received a sentence of three to
six years that ran concurrent with the sentence he
received in Federal Court.

Because this case involves narcotics,

YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

SANDOVAL

cocaine in particular, I would ask you to minimize the prejudicial effect of hearing about another cocaine conviction. Although it was from 12 years ago, I just ask Your Honor to indicate that he had a prior felony conviction.

THE COURT: Were there crimes that you are alluding to asking about?

MR. BERLAND: Your Honor, although he does have a lengthy record, I don't think it's proper to go into crimes that occurred before 1982, and those were the other crimes on his record.

If I can clear one thing up. Count two of the Federal indictment which the defendant plead guilty under the possession of that shotgun was during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime.

THE COURT: I accept what you read. Show it to Mr. Keith and then I'll go ahead and make the ruling.

MR. KEITH: I don't have the United

States Code with me. I believe the Code simply says, with regard to Section 924, I believe it just talks about weapons. It's my understanding that in that case there was some underlying

=DECISION =

allegations with regard to narcotics. Mr. Green did not plead to any narcotics charge, he just pled to the weapons charge?

THE COURT: When the Court has to rule on a Sandoval application, it has to answer two questions. Will the testimony elicited on cross-examination have a disproportionate and improper impact on the triers of fact? And whether apprehension of the introduction undesirably deter a defendant from testifying and denying the jury significant material evidence?

The Court of Appeals has taken pity by providing guidelines and rules that we can employ to use in the analysis of the proper balance to be struck between a defendant being questioned about the entirety of his or her criminal history versus the defendant's being able, in a somewhat unfettered status, to present a version of events favorable to him or her. Oftentimes, as the Court of Appeals has observed, oftentimes the only source of information favorable to them.

The Court of Appeals has said that there are basically three categories of cases analyzed. One is the catch-all, the crimes that indicate a person has a desire to place his or her interest

DECISION

ahead of society. The Ali Ramin (phonetic) choice of crime where you repeatedly commit over a demonstrable period of time the same kind of criminal conduct. Finally, those crimes which are more specifically directed towards honesty, such as robberies and burglaries, larcenies and perjuries.

The idea is to give both the defendant some ability to testify, not completely encumbered by their record, and giving the jury a realistic basis to take credibility into account of the ongoing evidence being inveighed to it by the testifying defendant.

It's unfortunate that oftentimes in the news over the last several years we have heard about one or another form of kidnapping and it strikes fear in everybody's heart. Whether a defenseless child or somebody older, kidnapping is one of those things that is difficult for somebody to deal rationally with the idea of removing a person from their normally anticipated life routine.

Be it encumbered with criminality or innocence, kidnapping is not something that the judicial institution can overcome. So it seems to

me were the jury to glean any fact regarding the defendant's participating and being convicted and fleeing from an allegation about kidnapping, there would be no further effort to listen to what Mr. Green had to say.

That doesn't mean that the fact of the felony conviction is obscured or eradicated, but certainly a reference to it can't be elicited during the course of any cross-examination.

The difficulty with the Green situation as it relates to Sandoval is the difficulty that relates to many repeat offenders in the drug realm. They are in a position of both saying I haven't been convicted of drug cases to all in the Ali Ramin regimen, and the ones convicted, you shouldn't be allowed to use them because, after all, what I'm on trial for is a drug case as well.

If we all remember, or at least I do, before the Sandoval case under Schwartzman, anything you ever did was properly the subject of cross-examination under the old rules which, obviously, produced significant unexpected fairness most of the time, but the Sandoval rule was not designed to shield entirely and recuse from the responsibility of their past crime. It's

COLLOQUY

re-writing of history, but only to a certain extent.

If Mr. Green were to testify, he can be asked whether he has two felony convictions with regard to the event as described in 1994. He can be asked whether or not he possessed a shotgun. And with regard to the 1996 case, he can be asked whether he sold controlled substances to a person who turned out to be an undercover officer in Manhattan. I think that would be sufficient.

I do have a couple of cases on tomorrow, but not enough that we can't do jury selection tomorrow and finish jury selection on Wednesday and then begin the testimony or part of the trial. Do we work on Fridays or not?

MR. KEITH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Don't think I'm signaling him out. I ask this of virtually everybody who gives me the response. I assume the only reason you are going to trial is you expect to be acquitted. I can't imagine any other reason other than you will be acquitted.

I ask you to consider two things. Whatever your answer, it's fine. If you are going to be acquitted, you will get acquitted just that

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

-COLLOQUY

much quicker if we work five days a week. The other thing I'd like you to consider is the effect of your not working on Friday on all of the other people who want a trial who are presently incarcerated in Riker's Island.

Not signaling you out again, but as somebody who has been through the system, you may remember the New York State Supreme Court criminal term in Manhattan as having 53 judges. Right now, we have got something like 32, some of whom their courtroom assignments don't allow them to do any trials at all, ever.

A certain percentage of judges do trials only four days a week, if there is a five-day week. Of course, those people don't have trials if they have religiously-observing people on Friday. And so, the point here is, as you can undoubtedly glean, is the trial capacity is --

Your Honor, we'll work on

THE COURT: All right, fine. So there you have it.

MR. KEITH:

Fridays.

Anything else to discuss or do we take the rest of the day off? Come in at ten after ten; that way, I might be able to get a couple of

my calendar cases out of the way. We will start
with jury selection at about 10:00, 10:15.
MR. KEITH: Very well, Your Honor.
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.
COUNTY OF NEW YORK PART-93
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
-against- HEARING
EDWADD CDEEN
EDWARD GREEN,  Defendant
September 9, 2008
PFFOPE, HONODADIE E MOLAHOULTA TOO
B E F O R E: HONORABLE E. MCLAUGHLIN, JSC
(Appearances as previously mentioned.)
THE CLERK: Recalling case on trial,
Edward Green.
THE COURT: This thing has to be tried.
There is the right to appeal, but is the sticking
point. Does that ring any bells or not anywhere
near what you're talking about?
MR. KEITH: It rings some bells. I think
the actual time numbers could be adjusted
slightly.
YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

### =PROCEEDINGS =

THE COURT: What about the right to appeal thing? This is what struck me, struck me --

MR. KEITH: It's my understanding that the People's position is a recommended sentence of eight years incarceration with no right to appeal; is that correct?

MR. BERLAND: That is correct. The defendant I'm sure is aware if convicted of the A-1 faces a maximum of 24 years as a nonviolent predicate felon.

THE COURT: Let's put that aside just for a moment. I think I see the easy and obvious solution to this. Since clearly the right to appeal is the thing that Mr. Green is interested in, and, indeed, I gather that's where he thinks his hope lies, just an observation, what number past two and a half years could possibly cause him to worry? The final appeal would be over in two and a half years.

What does he care whether it's 11 and a half or 12 and 3 quarters? His hope is after two and a half years in jail, the final appeal is resolved in his favor and he'll walk out the door. It doesn't matter to him whether the bottom line,

=PROCEEDINGS = 1 ultimate far out left to the number is 15, 22, 24, 11, he's going to get out from, his standpoint, as 2 3 soon as the appeal is decided. 4 My suggestion is the People want 5 something, he wants something, why don't we 6 say 11 years and the right to appeal? 7 MR. KEITH: Eleven years and no right to 8 appeal? 9 THE COURT: And the right to appeal. 10 MR. KEITH: I don't believe --11 THE COURT: If that doesn't satisfy him, 12 then I don't follow his logic. 13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KEITH: He knows he may have a chance in appeal with regard to the standing issue, but may also be denied in the appeal. Certainly, he would like to resolve the case and minimize the exposure and exercise the right to appeal.

In my discussions with Mr. Green, I don't think he will agree to 11 years. We're thinking more in the lines of 6 years or something like that.

Well, the People, from their THE COURT: standpoint, have to have something. They think they're going to win.

MR. KEITH: Right. They're think they're =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

#### PROCEEDINGS =

going to win and run the table and then he will wind up in the twenties. He doesn't want to expose himself to the twenties. He wants to do something smart. I thought his thinking was he's going to win on the appeal?

MR. KEITH: Of course.

THE COURT: Now, he might win on appeal with regard to the suppression. It seemed to me that 11 and a right to appeal would be something that everybody gets. I'm interested in doing Manning and Mcnair later on today, which is another trial, I will do this one. We're going to start in seven minutes. If you cannot work it out, we'll have ourselves a trial in seven minutes.

(Pause in proceedings.)

THE COURT: Ready for the jury?

MR. KEITH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Bring the jury down, please.

MR. KEITH: Your Honor, another thing. I haven't tried one with you in a while. I know you fill up the box.

THE COURT: Twenty people.

MR. KEITH: In the box, though?

THE COURT: After I do my schmoozing and

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ==

### =PROCEEDINGS =

my introductory legal recitation, yes. It will take me about 21 minutes to inculcate them, and then we call a panel and you get 15 minutes first round, 10 minutes second round. Don't feel compelled to use all the time.

With regard to the expert, you will be picking up 14 smart people. I don't know that they need an expert.

MR. KEITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We haven't resolved this.

I'm leaning. I usually lean left and I am leaning that way now. Assuming we got 14 intelligent people, the witnesses who will be called have some familiarity with narcotics and consequently they're able to talk somewhat, other than being denominated an expert, they are able to say the hand-held digital scales or something else.

MR. BERLAND: Yes.

THE COURT: So the average Manhattan dweller doesn't have one in the apartment, let alone three or five. I bet that the average citizen in Manhattan doesn't have any heat sealing plastic devices, and you contend there are lots, several?

MR. BERLAND: I believe eight.

# PROCEEDINGS —

1	THE COURT: And this isn't a restaurant.
2	And then thousands of plastic bags?
3	MR. BERLAND: Correct.
4	THE COURT: Immediately packaged
5	somewhere?
6	MR. BERLAND: Some neat, some loose, some
7	in garbage bags.
8	THE COURT: You do not need an expert.
9	MR. BERLAND: Can they discuss the
10	pricing of the narcotics recovered?
11	THE COURT: Yes, that's usual. It's
12	having somebody else come in to talk about things
13	that are not required to be contributed by an
14	expert, but left within the common sense of the
15	jury having been told something about the nature,
16	because paraphernalia requires some description of
17	what would ordinarily be a household item, so to
18	speak, which takes on that various purpose under
L9	some circumstances.
20	You have a right to have a witness or the
21	two witnesses you intended to call describe what
22	converts a plastic bag, such as the one with my
23	peanut butter and jelly sandwich down in my
24	office, what converts a peanut butter and jelly
25	sandwich package into something that would be a

<b>-</b> P	R	OC	EE	D	ΙN	GS
------------	---	----	----	---	----	----

	1
1	misdemeanor where you subject a person to a year
2	in jail.
3	MR. KEITH: Your Honor, another thing,
4	count two of the indictment as to my client
5	THE COURT: What is count two?
6	MR. KEITH: The charge that Mr. Brown
7	plead guilty to.
8	THE COURT: Yes, this was the bench
9	discussion about whether there's a connection
10	between Mr. Green and the contents of count two.
11	MR. KEITH: Yes, Your Honor. The keys
12	have been suppressed.
13	THE COURT: Who did that? In the learned
14	times and the fair courts always sometimes
15	suppress lots of stuff.
16	MR. KEITH: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you
17	very much. I take what I can get.
18	THE COURT: That sometimes is a good
19	advice to other people involved in a court
20	process. Take what you can get. Anyway, you were
21	saying?
22	MR. KEITH: I hear you loud and clear.
23	THE COURT: Well, we go back a while.
24	Your client and I don't, but anyway, go ahead.
25	MR. KEITH: Your Honor, the second count
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOD COURT DEPORTER

#### PROCEEDINGS =

of the indictment, referring to the drugs that were recovered from the second floor apartment, those drugs D felony possession with intent to sell, the connection between Mr. Green and that apartment was primarily the keys recovered from him. I believe a detective would have testified that one or two of the keys that he had were keys for that second floor apartment.

The other connection to the apartment I think is somewhat tenuous and certainly to prove constructive possession of the stuff recovered in the second floor apartment, to prove dominion and control beyond a reasonable doubt would be impossible for the People. That charge should be dismissed.

THE COURT: Your prediction may be accurate, but I don't think there's any conviction by which I can do that, other than by reserving to see what a jury does because of the Brown case which doesn't even address a motion at this juncture but rather a motion at the end of the case where the People would have no opportunity to appeal if I were to say you're right, dismissed by not giving them a way to see what a jury does.

What is the second connection other than -YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER -----

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

keys or do you have two, three or four connections?

MR. BERLAND: I believe I have two, three or four connections. There are two issues, with all due respect, to Mr. Keith. Count two of the indictment is possession with intent to sell, in the A weight possession as to the drugs recovered in the second floor apartment.

This defendant was in an apartment with half a kilo of cocaine. We contend he possessed with intent to sell. Count two applies to the drugs in both apartments. It shouldn't be dismissed for the grounds that Mr. Keith argues.

As far as the connection --

THE COURT: Suppose there were other drugs under somebody else's control within the building. Obviously, you cannot say because somebody else had drugs in the building, somehow that's drugs that he, Green, possessed also intent to sell some or all of it. I don't think what you said is compelling persuasion. Do you have some other -- it is the connection.

MR. BERLAND: I am moving on to the connection.

> THE COURT: I was dismissing your first =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

#### =PROCEEDINGS =

effort.

MR. BERLAND: All I am saying count two doesn't apply to the second apartment. It applies to the drugs in the apartment where the defendant was located.

As far as the connection --

THE COURT: Let's be clear about that.

You say, and at this juncture, they're not having been litigation in the motion stage and a Bill of Particulars specifying, et cetera, et cetera, you say that he, Green, is charged with possession —with intent to sell of what was found in the second floor apartment?

MR. BERLAND: Yes, Your Honor, that's what he's charged with among other drugs within the building. Charged with possession with intent to sell the half a kilo recovered in the fourth apartment, not the second apartment.

THE COURT: What is he accused of doing with respect to the second floor apartment?

MR. BERLAND: I will get to the connection. I, obviously, am aware that the keys were suppressed which allowed him into the second floor; however, we do have the issue of the video monitors.

#### =PROCEEDINGS =

A detective will testify that the monitors went solely to the second floor apartment where defendant Brown was located and the fourth floor apartment where Mr. Green was located.

Additionally, there was numerous paraphernalia, Ziploc bags to be exact, in cigar boxes, red cigar Philly blunt boxes. Same boxes recovered in the second floor apartment as were recovered in the fourth floor apartment. There were loose Ziploc bags stamped Red Apple found in the second floor apartment and fourth floor apartment.

THE COURT: With no residue in it?

MR. BERLAND: With no residue in it. The bags packaged ready to be sold, the Ziploc bags in the second floor apartment were sealed in the same manner, cut the same size as the bags found in the fourth floor apartment, which were packaged for sale. In the safe, there were --

THE COURT: I don't need to hear any more. There is no way in the world that a judge is allowed to take that factual decision away from a jury. So the application to dismiss at this juncture is denied.

With regard to scheduling, we'll pick a =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

## -PROCEEDINGS ---

1	jury as much as we can and finish tomorrow. Some
2	point in the morning, you will start calling your
3	cases. You need Thursday morning or afternoon off?
4	MR. KEITH: Morning.
5	THE COURT: Just remind me. That's the
6	sort of thing that not only goes against my
7	nature, but will slip through my conscious and I
8	don't want to be responsible for baby-sitting 14
9	jurors on Thursday morning.
10	MR. BERLAND: Can he speak to his client
11	about the issue of the chemist?
12	THE COURT: Oh, yes. Are the
13	sandwich-type bag coin-type bags or Zips?
14	MR. BERLAND: Variety. Some small Zips,
15	some loose plastic bags which contain wraps, some
16	are kilo wrappers.
17	MR. KEITH: The kilo wrappers were in the
18	garbage.
19	MR. BERLAND: In the garbage but out in
20	the open.
21	MR. KEITH: What do you mean?
22	MR. BERLAND: A plastic bag hanging on
23	the wall open with tons of kilo wrappers inside.
24	THE COURT: Tons?
25	MR. BERLAND: Numerous. I apologize.

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ===

# -VOIR DIRE -

1	MR. KEITH: From the review of the Grand
2	Jury minutes, there were two bags of garbage in
3	the closet.
4	THE COURT: In Sesame Street, from trash
5	to treasures. One person's trash is another
6	person's treasure. It depends on your perspective.
7	Whether garbage or unused packaging for drugs.
8	MR. KEITH: That's how it's characterized
9	in the Grand Jury minutes.
10	THE COURT: Well, Grand Jury
11	presentations are what they're. Whoever possessed
12	the things, I'm sure they didn't possess
13	non-narcotic items.
14	With regard to the stipulation regarding
15	the chemist.
16	MR. KEITH: We'll stipulate that the
17	white powdery substance is cocaine.
18	MR. BERLAND: I anticipate you will
19	mention to the jury that only one defendant is at
20	the table, although two men were arrested.
21	THE COURT: Summon the citizens, please.
22	COURT OFFICER: Jury entering.
23	MR. KEITH: Your Honor, may we approach
24	briefly?
25	THE COURT: Yes.

## =VOIR DIRE =

THE COURT: You are all here as possible jurors. This is a Supreme Court criminal term. We are about to begin selection that will decide a criminal charge.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

If you were on the jury before, listening to the orientation, we do jury selection on question and answer form. The lawyers and I have questions for you, and for your participation in that, we need to administer to you now either an oath or affirmation.

Anybody prefer to affirm as opposed to swear? Anybody have any idea what I am talking about? Nobody is affirming. Please stand up and take the oath.

THE CLERK: Raise your right hand. (Prospective jurors comply.)

THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will truthfully answer all questions put to you relative to your qualifications to serve as jurors in the case of the People of the State of New York versus Edward Green. Answer please.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =



2.0

=VOIR DIRE =

THE COURT: Did anybody say no? Good start. In order to intelligently and honestly answer questions, I need to tell you something in outline form about the law that controls a criminal case anywhere in the U.S.

You have to accept that the only person in a criminal courtroom in the United States who has to do anything or prove anything is the person who represents the government, the prosecution.

Whether it's in a Federal Court in Maine or state court in Hawaii, the only person who has to prove anything is the person who represents the government.

In some places, that's the state of Iowa, refers to itself as the State, Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth, of New York, Illinois and California refer to the government as the People. The government, the State, the People bring the charge.

Under the system created, it is the State, prosecution's obligation to prove the charge. They have to meet a certain standard of proof which you know is something called proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

The accused who does not want to be in =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

=VOIR DIRE =

the courtroom or in any other defendant doesn't want to be a courtroom, they're presumed innocent. If you are presumed innocent, what left is there for to you do? You're presumed innocent. That's the starting point. So you do not have to prove anything.

To demonstrate that, put some flesh on it, to particularize it, an accused in his or her own trial, does not have to testify, the lawyer doesn't have to ask questions of the witness, they do not have to call witnesses. They can literally look over at the prosecution's table and say, You brought the charges prove them if you can.

For there to be a resolution, a decision, the jury has to agree as to the charge as you go through the verdict sheet. If there is more than one charge, the jury doesn't make a decision about a charge until all the voting jurors are in agreement that the charge has or has not been established, proven.

I have nothing to do with that. You've created a jury system. Some relatively sophisticated places around the globe don't have jury trials. They have a judge or three judges or judge surrounded by military officers. I guess to

2.2

=VOIR DIRE =

make sure the judge gets it right, some places, they just shoot you.

We have a jury trial system which brings you here because you have said and I'm in full agreement with it that I can't decide this.

I'm here every working day and many non-working days, happily, competently, but we all have said better to have, let's try that without the word people, but better to have the rig-of-the-mill citizens decide the cases rather than somebody with a black robe who got it, who knows how, who has seen it all being done. So that's why you're here and that is, of course, why you cannot leave.

Once there is a charge, and a request for a trial, you just heard me say it doesn't go away until you folks decide it. Once there is an indictment and a request for a trial, no judge, even one who has been here for over 25 years, if you believe that, no judge can look at the prosecution and say, You know, I'm fed up with this, dismiss it. No judge can look at the accused and say, I'm fed up, plead guilty.

As we all know, once an indictment and request for a trial, there has to be a trial.

=VOIR DIRE =

Everything stays as it was on the day of the arrest.

Understand, there probably isn't one prospective juror here who doesn't think your time can be better used someplace else doing anything else. I also don't think any one of you upon any amount of reflection would want this decision or other decisions made down in the courthouse made by people who had nowhere better to be. I can't go to institutions and get jurors. You are it. You're it.

This is the user-friendly New York State court system. You folks have a benefit that virtually no state accords, gives to its citizen jurors and that is a one-time get-out-of-jury-service free. You've either taken it or you haven't. So you are here to serve in this case.

Longest trial I did as a judge was four and a half months. Four and a half months. The longest trial you know about took 13 months. There is no special list of losers to serve on cases that take more than a couple days. Imagine that you signed up for National Guard unit to get commodity, extra pay, instead you get your arms

-VOIR DIRE =

blown off, eat sand, don't get a shower for weeks. You want to talk about a hardship. Tens of thousands of people lying dead in military cemeteries who would like to serve on the case, but they can't.

Anybody have religious, moral or ethical beliefs in judging another human being; anybody think only God can do that and we cannot judge a humankind?

My job is to explain what the law is.

Your function is to decide the case. The way you
do that is to make accuracy and credibility
judgments about witnesses. You will decide who to
believe, if anybody, what extent to believe them,
then decide what facts you are going to use to
make your decision. My job is to explain the law.
Put your assessment of the facts, of the
testimony, together with the law, and you decide
whether it's proven or not proven.

In making these assessments, judgments on the accuracy and credibility of witnesses, you do that in the same way you do in your own lives. You've survived in New York whether for seven months or 70 years.

Every week, month, somebody whom you do =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

-VOIR DIRE -

not know under a variety of circumstances starts to talk to you. When you realize they want you to do something, this stranger with whom you have no history, you do two things, automatically as New Yorkers, without my standing around saying let me tell you how to figure this out, you judge, you assess both the person talking to you and the content of what they're saying without my having to be there. You decide whether or not what the person is saying makes sense.

Does it fit in with life in New York as you know it exists?

Does what the person says to you here from the witness stand, does it sound like that person actually lived through an event or does it sound like the person is trying desperately to say what they were told to say?

Does it have a naturalness or artificial sense about it? Is it fantasy, is it fact? Your decision.

Is it fact or contradicted by something else?

What's your comfort level with the witness as he or she is talking to you?

What's in it for them?

=VOIR DIRE =

The stranger talking to you what do they want from you or what do they get out of it if they convince to you do it? Those are the judgments you make, and those are the same judgments you make here.

In this case you will see and hear police testimony. It's difficult to have a criminal trial without police officers testifying. Sure you can have a little lady bopped on the head, bleed a lot and have a trial with just a little old lady and the doctor and may be a Good Samaritan or two. Usually, you have New York City police officers testify or state troopers.

This is a case where the New York City
Police Department will be the witnesses. What does
that mean? I have to tell you. Well, not much,
except what the law is. The law says you can't
believe or disbelieve somebody because of their
occupation. If you have had a bad experience with
a plumber, you can't discount every plumber's
testimony. The law says you can't believe or
disbelieve a person because of their occupation,
that applies to police officers.

You know that some police officers get up, go to work, shot, killed and go directly to

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

\_\_\_\_

=VOIR DIRE =

heaven. Some go to work, commit crimes and wind up in state prison. There are about 39,200 people somewhere had the middle. Are they heroes here or normal civilians, just folks.

We have this rule on your behalf because you are responsible for the law that says essentially the Eleventh Commandment, thou shall not stereotype. If you do not like being judged before anybody evaluates you, do not do it in the courtroom, for heaven's sake. We are looking for people who will listen and make up their mind. Not make up their mind as soon as they see a person or listen to a situation.

If you didn't get the apartment, didn't get a loan, get a promotion, this or that and you realize the reason you didn't get it was because the decision was made before merits were evaluated, you were stereotyped. Think about how sick you were when you discovered that happened. That's the reason why New York says thou shall not stereotype.

I generally don't care. I get paid the same salary since 1999, I get the same salary, whether you find guilt or non-guilt, whether you believe or disbelieve a police officer, I don't

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

) 1 

# =VOIR DIRE =

care. My job is to make sure you follow the law, which is judge after, not before.

Sentencing. Somebody out there could be saying, sentencing, oh my heavens, start sweating perspiring, having cramps. In order to remove that consideration from you, you and your wisdom have said with regard to what might happen in the future, you cannot be concerned with that. You can't, because it's both legally and logically irrelevant what might happen if there is a conviction. You can't worry about what might happen. You're here to decide whether a past event happened, whether the prosecution in this present trial can prove it to have happened.

If there is a sentence to be imposed, you have nothing whatever to do with it. That's the law you have created. I would be the one to do sentencing. I probably am the only one, apart from your children, if you have children or had them. I'm the only one in the room who has ever imposed a sentence. If I have to impose a sentence here, I will know more about the person to be sentenced than any other human being on the globe. You can't worry about sentencing. It is not your job. You look back rather than forward.

=VOIR DIRE =

Mr. Garber, hello.

Who knows Robert Morgenthau, personal friends, personal acquaintance, hangs or chills with Bob, brunches with Bob, picks apples with Bob?

I expected as much. For 25 years, 25 to 27 times a year, I've asked the question and the answer is virtually identical repetition of what just happened, stunned silence, that anybody would have an interpersonal relationship with the elected district attorney of Manhattan who appears to be a recluse and social failure.

As Hal Brenner used to say, wonder amount. Continual confabulation. I cannot understand it, especially since it is routinely since the 1800 he's elected every four years. He's never been here in the 25 plus years I have been here. He is, however, represented by an assistant DA named Jason Berland.

Stand up and see if anybody knows you. MR. BERLAND: Good morning.

THE COURT: Must be one of the job's criteria.

Next thing might strike you as odd, too.

I hope it will because it's memorable. You can't

YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

=VOIR DIRE =

be a defendant in a New York State Supreme Court by volunteering. We don't take volunteers. Two things have to happen before you can get to be a defendant in a New York State Supreme Court and be on trial. You have to be indicted and arrested.

So everybody, those found not guilty by the jury, as well as those found guilty by the jury started the process by an arrest and an indictment, and so intelligent folks like yourselves and I can perceive intelligence among all of you.

Intelligent people trying to figure out the correct result here will not pause a nanosecond trying to figure out what the effect of the arrest and indictment are on the verdict because you just heard me say whether you will be acquitted or found guilty, you started off the same way. Your focus is not what happened with the arrest and indictment, it's what happens from the witness stand.

I will introduce the person accused here. The person's name is Edward Green. This is the plexiwheel you heard about since children.

Mr. Green, stand up and see if anybody knows you. This is Edward Green. Anybody think

\_\_\_\_\_\_YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

## =VOIR DIRE =

they know or have seen or heard of Edward Green?

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

THE COURT: Have a seat. He's represented by Arnold Keith. Does anybody know Mr. Keith?

MR. KEITH: Good morning, everyone.

THE COURT: We're about to call 20 people, put you in the box and ask you questions. There is a trait found among some New Yorkers that I need to address. First thing I want to say is how many people here are in favor of crime? You are under oath. Nobody here is in favor of crime? All right.

Let's say, now that I probably have your attention, right now in the United States there are 30,000 criminal trials. Let's say there are 12 jurors per trial, 360,000 jurors right now in Hawaii and Maine, and how many of them do you think are in favor of crime? None.

So pendulumly speaking, what does that mean about the relationship about not liking crime and being a fair juror? They blend together easily. They're not mutually exclusive. You can be opposed to crime, indeed you can be violently opposed to crime and serve fairly on a jury where

=VOIR DIRE:

a crime is charged provided you meet the common sense U.S. standard, which is what? As best as is humanly possible, given the nature of the charge, you set aside the emotional components, the emotional reaction that tend to that crime and trial.

So in a rape of a four-year old girl, I don't have to find 12 people in favor of raping children. I just have to find 12 people who, when they get agitated, will recognize the agitation for what it is. Not being proof, they will say, all right, I am a human being, that's affecting me, so I'm, as best as is humanly possible, discounting that, setting it aside and refocusing on my original evaluation of what the proof is or absence of proof.

is accused of possessing what you will hear is over half a kilogram of drugs and we're having a trial. New York has a definition of possession, which I'll explain at the appropriate time, and you need to decide whether the prosecution can prove the elements of the crimes with which Mr. Green is charged. That's it. The republic, the government, your standard of living will not

**=**VOIR DIRE=

be affected whether you find him guilty or not guilty. I can't do it.

I don't know what kinds of lengthy or short trials are happening on this floor and the floors above and below us or 60 Centre or 111 Centre Street or down at 49 Thomas Street. I can't tell you where you will go if you are excused at this trial. I don't know and I will purposely remain ignorant. If there is a trial across the street down the corridor that will take two weeks, four weeks, four months, I don't know. I purposely remain ignorant.

I will put you folks in a position to decide the case, either next Monday or next Tuesday. However long you decide your deliberations take is up to you. I expect, having consulted with the lawyers, to put you in a position to decide the case next Monday or Tuesday, and I emphasize I don't know what's happening in other buildings where you will be sent if not selected here.

Now, some people say, Judge, you just said that you will put us in a position to decide the case next Monday or Tuesday, yet asking us today and perhaps some of tomorrow morning, can we

-VOIR DIRE =

be fair. Can't you ask us next Monday or next Tuesday? The answer is no. Today is the day we're picking the jury. So you need to say it. This is something I'm fair about or not fair about it.

We'll call 20 people. This doesn't guarantee you will be selected. Do not panic if your name is among the first 20. Many, many people will be called. As I said, not everybody called will be chosen. Gather your gear, take the questionnaire and prepare your answers.

Go ahead.

2.0

THE CLERK: Seat number one,
Wendy Shrijver. Seat number two, Phyllis Wein.
Shanera Stuart, seat number three.
Timothy Carvin, seat number four. Robert Cole,
seat number five. Kathleen Mitchell, seat number
six. Megan Stubbendeck, seat number seven.
Manuel Salgado, Seat number eight. Melissa Pinker,
seat number nine. Caroline Wicker, seat number
ten. Stacy Sullivan, seat number 11. David
Riley, seat number 12. Michael Wagner, seat
number 13. Gerforne Johnson, seat number 14.
Qubell Haile, seat number 15. Omar Perez, seat
number 16. David Daniels, seat number 17.

2.0

## =VOIR DIRE =

Bienvenido Caba, seat number 18. James Wysock, seat number 19. Rafael Taveras, seat number 20.

Those who names are yet to be called, don't have the questionnaire, and the last question says, Given what you heard so far, can you be fair and follow the law?

I made reference to 30,000 trials and probably a lot more than that going on and then 30,000 plus ways of doing jury selection. The point of any judge's jury selection is to find people who can answer that question. Yes, I can be fair.

We tell you a little bit about what supposedly occurred. I forgot the address of the building.

MR. BERLAND: 451 Lenox Avenue.

THE COURT: 451 Lenox Avenue. Do you remember what the cross streets are?

MR. BERLAND: Between 132nd and 133rd Streets.

THE COURT: Okay, that's the place.
You've heard what the allegation is. We have this questionnaire. I'm going to tell you how you would answer the questions.

Questions two and three make a reference -YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER -----

-VOIR DIRE:

to New York City. What I'd like, if you can do it is give me one answer. What I mean by that, if you have a relative in the five boroughs, I don't want you to go borough by borough, just say about 15 relatives in the City of New York that includes all five boroughs or here by myself or whatever it is. I have over hundred people, I lost count at 55.

Question five asks are you working.

Don't just say no or yes. The lawyers and

Mr. Green need to know something about you. I do

not want to know where you work, but for example

if you work in a store, say retail store, manager,

cashier. I work in a bank, loan officer, computer

person. You do not have to say I'm a geek. Just

what kind of work do you do.

If you are in school, what is it that you are studying. Do you have a major. If you are retired, what did you do before you retired. If, unfortunately, you recently were laid off, quit or fired, I need to know what your job experience was.

I need to know your neighborhood, Battery Park City, Harlem, Murray Hill. With regard to 132nd Street, I'm going to ask you whether you

-VOIR DIRE =

live within three blocks in a circle, below blocks around Lenox and 132nd. If you do it, it doesn't disqualify you, just something Mr. Green and the lawyers and I need to know.

There is a last question I ask, which is not on the questionnaire and it is the following. Essentially, anything that is not on the questionnaire or about which we have not asked you with affects your ability to decide the case. You need to answer that question.

We start with Ms. Shrijver, start with you and go down the road to Mr. Salgado, back to Mr. Perez, move down to Ms. Pinker and the two folks on the side and two folks in the front. There it is, the hand-held microphone.

Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Wendy Shrijver. I live on the Upper East Side in Yorkville. I live there for two years. I'm not a New Yorker.

MR. KEITH: We lost the sign.

THE COURT: You were or were not born in New York.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was not born in New York. I was born in Connecticut.

-VOIR DIRE-

1	THE COURT: Maybe if you hit it against
2	your head? No, that's not good. Could somebody
3	help her?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work as a portrait
5	painter. That involves painting every day. It's
6	a free-lance job. I have a graduate degree. I
7	have been married. I have two children.
8	THE COURT: Do either live at home with
9	you?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Part of the time.
11	THE COURT: When they were younger, did
12	you speak with either or both about drugs?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Continue.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I served on a
16	criminal case that was settled.
17	THE COURT: You did not have to decide
18	it?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
20	THE COURT: Were there any criminal or
21	civil cases that you made a verdict?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
23	THE COURT: Continue.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have had a close
25	friend who was the victim of a crime.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER —

THE COURT: What happened to that pe 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She was raped.	rson?
Trans mappened to the pe	rson?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She was raped	
Sile was tapea.	
3 THE COURT: By somebody whom she kne	w or
4 did not know?	
5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Did not know.	
6 THE COURT: Did she report it?	
7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.	
8 THE COURT: Was it in New York State	?
9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.	
THE COURT: Continue.	
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have any	
12 relatives who are A or B.	
THE COURT: In law enforcement?	
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.	
THE COURT: Continue.	
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.	
17 THE COURT: No to what?	
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Number ten.	
THE COURT: They want to know what no	umber
20 ten is.	
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Family members of	_
close friends in conflict with the law. No.	
THE COURT: Actually, I think that's	the
victim of a crime.	
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, yes, okay.	
YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ————	<del></del>

<del>--</del>VOIR DIRE=

1 Right. Close friend being victim of a crime. 2 THE COURT: Twenty-five years, I should 3 know these questions. Go ahead. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't have any 5 moral or religious beliefs or opinions that might 6 conflict with the rules of law controlling 7 criminal cases. 8 THE COURT: There is no reason you 9 couldn't be fair and follow the law? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 11 THE COURT: You told us the neighborhood. 12 Anything which isn't on the questionnaire or I 13 didn't ask you which affects your ability to 14 decide the case? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 16 THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Wein. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Phyllis 18 Wein. I live in the Upper West Side for 39 years. 19 MR. KEITH: Upper West or East? 2.0 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Upper West. 21 THE COURT: Does it make a difference? 22 MR. KEITH: Yes. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm retired. 24 to retiring, I helped my husband in his business, 25 a mail order business. I graduated from college. I =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ==

=VOIR DIRE = 1 have two children. 2 THE COURT: Did you speak with them about 3 drugs? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did. 5 THE COURT: Did they listen? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Good. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have never served 9 on a criminal case. Fortunately, I don't have a 10 close friend or relative who has been a victim of 11 a crime. No, I do not have any relatives who are 12 attorneys or in law enforcement. No, I don't have 13 any family who has been in conflict with the law. 14 THE COURT: Actually, that says victim of 15 a crime. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No conflict. 17 THE COURT: I apologize. Periodically, 18 they do give us a vacation. Periodically, then, 19 somebody else sneaks in here and uses the 20 courtroom. I'm wondering whether we get a 21 different jury questionnaire. In any event, I will 22 keep my mouth shut and you will answer the

23

24

25

question.

MR. KEITH: On that issue, may we approach.

# -VOIR DIRE-

1	THE COURT: Sure.
2	(A discussion was held off the record.)
3	THE COURT: There is somebody named Louis
4	Bart Stone, but he ain't me. I don't use the word
5	"conflict." Anyway, we'll use his.
6	MR. KEITH: Sorry, Your Honor, one other
7	thing.
8	THE COURT: So am I. Mine certainly is
9	better.
10	(A discussion was held off the record.)
11	THE COURT: Forget about the
12	questionnaire. I want them back. Give the
13	questionnaires back. It must be that Judge Stone
14	doesn't plan on doing any more trials in his
15	career. What are his questionnaires here for?
16	So, Ms. Wein, people who said conflict, I
17	apologize. What neighborhood do you live in?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Upper West Side.
19	THE COURT: Any of the children at home
20	with you these days?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I'm a
22	grandmother.
23	THE COURT: Anything you need to tell us
24	about your ability to decide the case that isn't
25	on that now-discarded questionnaire?
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ———————————————————————————————————

-VOIR DIRE-

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 2 THE COURT: We'll go to Ms. Stuart. 3 Go ahead. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in Harlem, 4 5 Harlem Hospital. I have lived in New York all of 6 my life. All of my relatives --7 THE COURT: Since I haven't had the 8 pleasure of meeting your relatives, is that 15, 9 20? How many, roughly? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Roughly around 50. 11 THE COURT: Continue. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All of the relatives 13 that I know of live in New York City. I am not 14 married. I am working. 15 THE COURT: Doing what? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In a coffee company, 17 retail. 18 THE COURT: How long have you been there? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For two years. 20 THE COURT: Continue. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not have any 22 children. I am in my last year of School for 23 Culinary Arts. I have never served on a criminal 24 or civil jury. I have never served on a Grand 25 Jury. I've never served in the military. None of

<del>-</del>voir dire=

my relatives or close friends have been employed by any law enforcement. I've had two relatives convicted of a crime.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask everybody when I'm finished whether relatives or yourselves accused, victim of a crime. It happens. I will put that off until I finish the questions.

Go ahead, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have never been a party to a civil lawsuit, but I have been in court for other reasons.

THE COURT: What sort of things brought you to court? Family Court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For the relatives.

THE COURT: You went to their trials.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: I will ask you about that later. Continue, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I will follow the laws as the Court instructs. I will be fair.

THE COURT: Your neighborhood is what? I don't want your address. I'm not coming over or sending you a card. I want the general area in which you live.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Harlem.

### =VOIR DIRE=

THE COURT: Within three blocks of Lenox and 132nd?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Does that bother you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Anything else I need to know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Carvin.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in Massachusetts. I've lived in New York City for eight years. I have relatives in New York City. I'm not married, but I've lived with a girl for five years.

THE COURT: How is it working out?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am working, an insurance broker. I don't have any children. I have a college education. I have never served on a criminal or civil jury, nor a Grand Jury. I've never served in the military. I have no close friends or relatives employed by law enforcement agency. Neither myself or close friend a victim of a crime. I've never been a party to a civil lawsuit or been in court for any reason. I could certainly be fair and impartial and follow the law. I live in Gramercy.

2.1

# -VOIR DIRE-

THE COURT: You sound unsure about that? Are you sure you live in Gramercy?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am certain.

THE COURT: Say it, I live in Gramercy.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Gramercy.

THE COURT: Anything else I should know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Cole.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Robert Cole. I was born in New York. I've lived in New York City for five years. I have no other relatives that live in New York City. I'm married. I'm a consultant.

THE COURT: What kind of business or field?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Political action committee. My spouse works for Estee Lauder. No children. I'm college educated. I have never served on a civil or criminal jury or Grand Jury. Never served in the military. I do not have a close friend or relative that have been employed by the FBI or close friend or relative that's been a victim of a crime. I have no not been a party to a civil lawsuit. I can be fair and impartial. I live in the Upper East Side.

	65
	VOIR DIRE
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
2	THE COURT: Miss Mitchell.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hello.
4	THE COURT: Hi.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in
6	Worcester, New York. I've lived in the city five
7	years. I have about 20 relatives that live in New
8	York City. I'm married. I work at Discovery
9	Channel. My spouse, at CVS. No children. College
10	education. Never served on a criminal or civil or
11	Grand Jury or military. I'm have close friends
12	employed by law enforcement agencies.
13	THE COURT: What kind of
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Police officers in
15	Worcester, New York.
16	THE COURT: I don't mind speaking fast.
17	Keep going.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have close
19	relatives and friends that have been victims of a
20	crime.
21	THE COURT: What happened to your
22	relative?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Both were muggings in

25 THE COURT: Any serious injury, -YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER:

Maryland.

=VOIR DIRE=

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24

25

hospitalization, stitches?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Something serious to happen to one of your friends or one of your relatives?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just a little shaken up. I have never been party to a civil lawsuit. I believe being be fair and impartial. I live in the financial district.

THE COURT: Anything else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Stubbendeck.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in

Nebraska. I've lived in New York for one year.

THE COURT: Where do you come most directly, from Nebraska or someplace else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Recently from the University of Virginia. I am not married. I work as a tutor and instructor development.

THE COURT: What subject do you tutor in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: American history and
SATs. I have no children. My educational
background, finished my dissertation for Ph.D. in
American history. My dissertation in the history
of urban gangs.

THE COURT: You never know what might be =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER \_\_\_\_\_\_

	VOIR DIRE —
	VOIR DIRE
1	interesting to the attorney.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I assume that might
3	be interesting. I have never served on a civil or
4	criminal jury nor Grand Jury. I have never served
5	in the military.
6	THE COURT: Did you ever join a gang?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I have not been a
8	member of a gang. I have been a victim of a crime.
9	THE COURT: What happened to you?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was raped.
11	THE COURT: By somebody you knew or did
12	not know?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Somebody I did know.
14	THE COURT: Nebraska or somewhere else?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Somewhere else.
16	THE COURT: Did you report it to the
17	police?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
19	THE COURT: Continue. I don't know
20	what's wrong with the microphone.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've never been a
22	party to a civil lawsuit or in court for any
23	reason. Given what I heard so far, I could be fair
24	
Z4	and impartial and follow the law. Upper West

—YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

25

Side.

# -VOIR DIRE -

	VOIN BINE
1	THE COURT: Anything else?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Salgado.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. I was
5	born in New York City. I lived in New York
6	City 60 years. I have 15 relatives in the city.
7	I'm not married. I'm working respiratory in a
8	hospital. My girlfriend's occupation is a child
9	care provider. I have three children. My education
10	is high school graduate. I've never served in a
11	civil or criminal jury or Grand Jury. I was in
12	the military, in the army.
13	THE COURT: What period of time?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: '67 through '70.
15	THE COURT: Your specialty was what?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Grunt.
17	THE COURT: Did you serve overseas?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Vietnam. I have a
19	nephew that just recently retired from the
20	Correction Department.
21	THE COURT: City or state?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: City. I have no
23	friends or relatives that have been a victim to a
24	crime. I've never been in a civil lawsuit. I can
25	be fair and impartial, but Your Honor, I think

-VOIR DIRE-

1	there's something I would see you in private
2	about.
3	THE COURT: Private has its unique
4	meaning. You me and the lawyers. Come over here.
5	(Whereupon, a sidebar conference was held
6	on the record out of the hearing of the jury.)
7	THE COURT: What would you like to say?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My son was convicted
9	of drug trafficking. He did ten years in jail.
10	THE COURT: Is he still incarcerated?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. He's currently
12	out on parole or probation.
13	THE COURT: Can you be fair here or not?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so. It
15	kind of created a big problem between me and him,
16	the relationship.
17	THE COURT: I'll excuse you.
18	(Whereupon, the sidebar conference
19	concluded and the proceedings continued in open court
20	as follows:)
21	THE COURT: We'll excuse him. Fill seat
22	number eight, Mr. Salgado's seat.
23	THE CLERK: Ms. Hall.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in the
25	mountains of Virginia.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ——————

=VOIR DIRE = 1 THE COURT: East Virginia or West 2 Virginia? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Western Virginia. I've lived in New York City for five years. 4 5 have no relatives who live in New York. I'm not married. I'm working. I'm self-employed. 6 7 THE COURT: Doing what? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I run a business that 9 does VIP and specialty services. I don't have a 10 I have no children. I graduated from the 11 University of Virginia. Never served in a civil 12 or criminal jury, nor Grand Jury, nor the 13 military. I don't have any close friends or 14 relatives employed by law enforcement. Never had 15 a friend or relative a victim of a crime. Never 16 been party to a civil lawsuit or in court for any 17 other reason. I can be fair and impartial. I live 18 in Hells Kitchen. 19 THE COURT: Anything else? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. 22 Mr. Perez. Thank you. Mr. Perez.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My name is Omar

Perez. I was born in New York City. I've been living in New York for 41 years. I have about ten

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

23

24

-VOIR DIRE =

1 relatives. I am not married. I am working in a 2 hospital as a mechanic. I have a daughter. 3 THE COURT: Is she at home with you? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, she's not. 5 THE COURT: Is she old enough to be 6 spoken to about drugs? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She's only five years 8 old. Not at that concept yet. My educational 9 background is some engineering and some trade schools. I have served on two civil cases, 60 10 11 Centre Street. 12 THE COURT: Did you decide both civil 13 cases or settled? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We came to the end. 15 THE COURT: Please forget anything you 16 remember of what the judge said because the rules 17 in civil are different from the rules here. 18 will tell you anything you need to know. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. I have never 2.0 served in the military. I have two friends 21 employed by the New York City Police Department. 22 THE COURT: Blue uniforms or 23 plainclothes? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: One that wears a blue 25 uniform and another one that's a detective.

#### WOIR DIRE

	VOIR DIRE
1	THE COURT: What kind of detective work
2	does that fellow or woman do?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't get into too
4	much detail because sometimes he is on special
5	assignments.
6	THE COURT: Do you have any idea whether
7	it relates to organized crime, violation, sex
8	crimes?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: At the beginning of
10	his career, he had some encounters with criminals
11	and stuff like that, but I haven't gotten one into
12	details the past couple of months.
13	THE COURT: Fine. Continue.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Never a party to a
15	lawsuit or in court for any other reason.
16	THE COURT: Can you be fair and will you
17	follow the law?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I live in Inwood
19	area.
20	THE COURT: Anything else?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nothing else.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Haile.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in New
24	York. I have been living here for 22 years. I
25	have four relatives that live in the city. I am

<del>--</del>VOIR DIRE=

1 not married. I currently work in a hospital. 2 THE COURT: How long have you been there? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A month. 4 THE COURT: What do you do there? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A unit clerk, ICU. 6 THE COURT: Did you work before a month 7 ago? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. 9 THE COURT: What kind of work did you do 10 there? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same thing. 12 THE COURT: Different hospital? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. No children, I 14 have some college background. I never served in a 15 civil or criminal jury. Never in the Grand Jury. 16 Never was in the military. I have no close 17 relatives or friends that are in law enforcement. No friends victim of crime or relative. Never a 18 19 party to a civil suit. Yes, I can follow the law 20 and the Court's instruction. I live in the Upper 21 West Side. 22 THE COURT: Anything else? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 24 THE COURT: Next is Ms. Johnson. 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in North =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

=VOIR DIRE =

1	Carolina. I lived in New York City for 40 years.
2	THE COURT: No way.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you, Judge.
4	THE COURT: I said it was the
5	user-friendly New York State Court system.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have about 20
7	relatives here. I'm separated. I'm retired. I
8	worked from a communications company. My husband
9	worked for a park service. I have children.
LO	They're grown.
L1	THE COURT: Did you speak with your
L2	children as they were growing up about drugs?
L3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
L 4	THE COURT: Continue, please.
L5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm currently in
L 6	school to complete my Bachelor's. I never served
L7	on a civil or Criminal Court, a jury, nor a Grand
L8	Jury, nor military. I did have a cousin who
L9	recently retired from the police department.
20	THE COURT: Do you know what the person's
21	last job was within the police department?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
23	THE COURT: Any idea what the person did
24	as a police officer towards the end of his or her
25	career?

-VOIR DIRE-

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think she was mainly in the office. I have friends that were employed or currently employed as COs. Thank God we never had a relative or friend a victim of a crime. Never been a party to a civil lawsuit. Yes, I can be fair and impartial, and I live Upper West Side.

THE COURT: Correction officer.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: City or state?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: City.

THE COURT: Anything else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Wagner.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in Bayonne. Lived in New York City on and off for about six or seven years. I have one aunt who lives in Manhattan. I am not married. I have a fiance. I am working, self-employed doing website design and maintenance. My fiance's occupation is graphic design. We have a six-month-old son. I have a graduate degree. Never served on criminal or civil jury, Grand Jury or military. No close friends or relatives employed by law enforcement nor a victim of a crime. Never been a party to a

=VOIR DIRE =

1 civil lawsuit. I can follow law. I will be fair 2 and impartial, and I live in midtown, Hells 3 Kitchen. 4 THE COURT: Anything else? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Riley. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in New York all 8 my life. I have 20 relatives in the city. I'm 9 married. I work for the Board of Education, 10 custodial engineer. My wife works in a dental office. One child, she's four. I completed high 11 12 school. 13 THE COURT: Your four-year-old is not 14 working yet? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not yet. I served on 16 a criminal jury. They did reach a verdict. 17 THE COURT: Do not tell me the verdict. 18 Tell me the charge. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Possession of 20 narcotics. 21 THE COURT: How long did you decide that 22 case? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five days. 24 THE COURT: Did the lawyers or judge say 25 anything to you after you reached the verdict?

	VOIR DIRE ————————
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
2	THE COURT: Fine.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Never in the
4	military. My brother is a New York City police
5	officer.
6	THE COURT: What precinct?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 17th Precinct.
8	THE COURT: What's the nature of his
9	assignment?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's two years on the
11	job, blue-and-white car. I've never been the
12	victim of a crime. Never a civil lawsuit. I can
13	follow the instructions. I live in Upper
14	Washington Heights.
15	THE COURT: Anything else?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
17	THE COURT: Ms. Sullivan.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in Los
19	Angeles, California. Lived in New York 14 years.
20	No relatives here in New York. Not married. I
21	work for a magazine publishing company. I do not
22	have any children. I have a college degree. I
23	have never served on any type of jury. I have not
24	been in the military. No relatives employed by
25	law enforcement. I was a victim of a crime.

### =VOIR DIRE ==

1	THE COURT: What happened to you?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thirty years ago, a
3	theft. I have never been a party to a lawsuit for
4	any reason. I believe I can be impartial. I live
5	in midtown, Upper West Side area.
6	THE COURT: Tell me in two sentences
7	what you do at work.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Human resource.
9	THE COURT: That is a phrase.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I handle employment
11	issues and hire people.
12	THE COURT: So you've looked people in
13	the eye and say, you're hired, fired or not going
14	to be hired?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Some of that, yes.
16	THE COURT: Anything else?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My biological father
18	was a drug addict.
19	THE COURT: Tell me how that will affect
20	you as best you can determine now.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I can remain
22	impartial.
23	THE COURT: When you say "you think,"
24	does that mean you are satisfied to be impartial?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ——————

#### =VOIR DIRE =

1	THE COURT: The word "think" causes the
2	law system to get nervous. If you are satisfied
3	you can be fair regarding the substance, that's
4	fine with us.
5	Ms. Wicker.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in Texas.
7	I've lived in New York City for three years. I
8	have zero relatives in New York City. I'm not
9	married. I'm working. I am an executive
10	recruiter. I have a college degree. No children.
11	I've never served on a jury. Never served in the
12	military. I have about five lawyers in the
13	family, either on
14	THE COURT: Sorry to hear that. Are any
15	of them prosecutors or defense lawyers?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Either side.
17	Virginia, Tennessee and Texas.
18	THE COURT: Watch any of them, either
19	side, in a courtroom or trial?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21	THE COURT: Ever talk to them what
22	happens before a trial?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sometimes.
24	THE COURT: Talk about what happened
25	after the trial?

	VOIR DIRE
	VOII. DILL
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sometimes.
2	THE COURT: Any of that affect you?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
4	THE COURT: Continue.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been a victim
6	of a crime. I was robbed, my entire house.
7	THE COURT: Robbed when you were in your
8	residence?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Did the robber know you were
11	there when the robber was there robbing your
12	residence?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Was there interaction between
15	the two of you?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Were you injured?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
19	THE COURT: Did you ultimately report the
20	event to the police?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Did the police capture the
23	intruder?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
25	THE COURT: How long was that event,
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

#### —VOIR DIRE <del>—</del>

<b>)</b>	1	roughly?						
مستقال	2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five years ago.						
	3	THE COURT: It was in?						
	4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Waco, Texas.						
	5	THE COURT: West Texas.						
	6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right in the center						
	7	of Texas.						
	8	THE COURT: I got something wrong. I've						
	9	gotten used to that.						
	10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have not been a						
	11	party to a civil lawsuit. I do feel that I can						
	12	follow the law and will be fair and impartial. I						
	13	live on the Upper East Side.						
مهمسي	14	THE COURT: Anything else?						
	15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.						
	16	THE COURT: Ms. Pinker.						
	17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in						
	18	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I lived in New York for						
	19	three years. No relatives in the city. I'm						
	20	married. Currently unemployed.						
	21	THE COURT: What sort of work do you do?						
	22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right now?						
	23	THE COURT: No. I know you're						
	24	unemployed.						
	25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I did work as an						
art e		VIETTE DACHECO CENTOD COUDE DEDODEDO						

=VOIR DIRE =

insurance adjustor.

THE COURT: If that thing doesn't work we'll, do it without the microphone. You were an insurance adjustor in New York City?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: You've been unemployed basically three years?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Trying to convince my husband to let me go back to school to be a teacher. My husband works for J.P. Morgan Chase. No children. We have a dog. I have college education. I've never served on a jury before. I have never been called. Never served in the military. No close friends in law enforcement. I guess I got my car stolen one time.

THE COURT: Did you report that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Continue.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've never been a party to a civil lawsuit. I think I'm definitely sure I can be fair and impartial. Live on the Upper West Side.

THE COURT: What state did you come -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Illinois.

# -VOIR DIRE =

1	THE COURT: Ms. Wicker, what state did
2	you come from?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Texas.
4	THE COURT: We'll go to Mr. Caba.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in the
6	Dominican Republic. I live in New York for
7	about 17 years. I have more than 50 relatives,
8	friends in New York. I'm married.
9	THE COURT: What's your job?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maintenance.
11	THE COURT: Residence building?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Residential building.
13	My work wife works at the salon, hairstylist. I
14	have two children, 14 and 12.
15	THE COURT: Speak with them about drugs?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Always. I took some
17	writing and reading class from the unions that I
18	belong to. I never served in a Grand Jury before.
19	I never serve in military either, never. I do
20	have friends been employed by any law
21	enforcements, yes, I do.
22	THE COURT: How many police officers do
23	you know, roughly?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three.
25	THE COURT: Do you see them as often as
I	

#### —VOIR DIRE —

1	every month or less often than that?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. One of them,
3	like twice a month, and the other two, they'll be
4	here in the city.
5	THE COURT: Continue.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If I have any
7	relative or friends been victim? Yes.
8	THE COURT: Any victim of a violent
9	crime, anybody killed, anybody raped?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it's about drugs.
11	THE COURT: Some of your friends have
12	been convicted of drugs?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Some of them in state prison
15	now?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Does my name sound familiar.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Say again.
19	THE COURT: Does my name sound familiar.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21	THE COURT: Can you be fair in a drug
22	case knowing friends or relatives are in jail?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can be fair.
24	THE COURT: You can be?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
:	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ———————————————————————————————————

	85
	VOIR DIRE
1	THE COURT: Continue.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Never been in a
3	lawsuit before, any court before. I guess I could
4	be fair.
5	THE COURT: When you say "I guess I can
6	be fair," what does that mean? Are you uncertain
7	about being fair? It's just the way you phrased
8	it. Are you certain you can be fair? I cannot
9	ask you to explain your statement, "I guess I can
10	be fair."
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can be fair hundred
12	percent.
13	THE COURT: You are satisfied you can be
14	fair?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Anything else we should
17	know?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Lower East
19	Side.
20	THE COURT: Anything else?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's it.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	Mr. Daniels.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in New
	u e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

Jersey. I've lived in New York City for 25 years.

YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

25

-VOIR DIRE =

I have no relatives living in New York City. I'm 1 not married. I sell advertising. I have no 2 children. I have a college degree. I have served 3 on a criminal jury, and we did reach a verdict. 4 THE COURT: Don't tell me the verdict, 5 but what was the charge? 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a drug trial. THE COURT: Did anyone speak with you 8 after you decided the case? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 10 11 THE COURT: Roughly how long was your verdict? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five years ago. 13 14 Never served in the Grand Jury. Never served in the military. No close friends in law 15 16 enforcement. No victim -- none of my relatives 17 victims of crime. Never been a party to a lawsuit. I certainly can be impartial. I live in the Upper 18 19 East Side. 20 THE COURT: Anything else? 2.1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 2.2 THE COURT: Next I believe is Mr. Wysock. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was in born in 23 24 Indiana. Primarily from Chicago. Lived in New York for three years. No relatives in New York 25

-VOIR DIRE -

1	City. I am not married. I'm a surgical resident
2	in a hospital. I have a medical degree.
3	THE COURT: A part of the anatomy that
4	you are better at than others
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a urologist.
6	THE COURT: Does that mean that you are
7	good at that or better at cardiology?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My specialty. Never
9	served on a civil or criminal jury. Never served
10	on a Grand Jury. Never served in the military. I
11	have an uncle who was a police officer. He's
12	retired. I've been robbed of minor things many
13	times, but it's minor.
14	THE COURT: Face-to-face situations or
15	something out of your car or apartment or dorm
16	room?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. Never a
18	party to a civil lawsuit. I can be fair and
19	impartial. I live in the Upper East Side.
20	THE COURT: Anything else?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Taveras.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in the Dominican
24	Republic. Live in New York City for the
25	past 20 years. I am married. I work in

=VOIR DIRE = 1 commercial building as a handyman. My wife is 2 I have four children from ages four to 3 fifteen. Four girls. 4 THE COURT: Spoke with the older ones 5 about drugs? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I do. I just 7 finish high school back home. I never serve in 8 the military. I never serve in the Grand Jury. 9 No friend or relative employed by any law 10 enforcement agency. I've never been convicted of 11 a crime, except a relative charged of a crime. 12 THE COURT:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will ask you about relative charged with a crime in a minute.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I never been part of a lawsuit. I believe being fair and impartial. I live in Washington Heights.

> THE COURT: Anything else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, I need to ask the questions about arrests, accusations or convictions. As I said, it happens with any group of New Yorkers. We heard reference that it happened to yourself or relative.

You, yourself, ever arrested, accused of by somebody, but not arrested or actually

т	70	_	$\Box$	_	~	$\neg$	_
—\	$^{\prime}$	$\perp$	К	- 1)	1	КI	٩,

1	convicted of some crime or offense?
2	Mr. Wagner.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know if this
4	is what you mean. I was in court for DWI.
5	THE COURT: That's exactly what I mean.
6	Did you get a jail sentence, a program, fine,
7	suspension of license?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Lost license for six
9	months and 2 days, driver education.
10	THE COURT: Plead guilty or had a trial?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Had a trial.
12	THE COURT: A jury or judge?
L3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A judge.
L 4	THE COURT: Somebody else? Mr. Haile.
L5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was arrested.
L 6	THE COURT: For what sort of thing?
L7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Narcotics.
L8	THE COURT: As a misdemeanor?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Misdemeanor.
20	THE COURT: Did you get a jail sentence,
21	a fine, community service or go in sentence?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fine and community
23	service.
2.4	THE COURT: Did you do all that stuff?
2.5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
į	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER —

# ---VOIR DIRE----

THE COURT: Did it happen once or more
than once?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: More than once.
THE COURT: More than five times?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Between five and ten.
THE COURT: Each time a police officer
accused you of something or did on more than one
of the occasions a civilian say you did something?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Police officer.
THE COURT: Each time?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Did you have a trial in any
of those events?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
THE COURT: Plead guilty.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
THE COURT: Now we ask about relatives.
Relatives has a big meaning. Relatives means
civilian, domestic partners, people with whom you
have a sometime, frequent, intimate relationship,
it also means spouses, parent, children, brothers,
sisters. Any among that population arrested,
accused of, convicted of a crime?
Ms. Sullivan.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father.

	91 VOIR DIRE
	VOIR DIRE
1	THE COURT: You were an infant or not
2	born?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Small child.
4	THE COURT: Somebody else?
5	Mr. Perez.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father was
7	convicted of a narcotics charge.
8	THE COURT: In New York?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
10	THE COURT: State prison sentence?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. He was acquitted
12	that case.
13	THE COURT: Now, he was accused by police
14	officers or do you know the circumstances?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was accused by
16	police officers.
17	THE COURT: The jury said not guilty?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There was no jury.
19	THE COURT: The judge said not guilty?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Mrs. Stuart, what's your
22	situation?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father, he still
24	has a warrant out.

THE COURT: So one of my colleagues would

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

25

-VOIR DIRE =

1 like to see your father. For what would my 2 colleague like to see your father; drugs, robbery? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Drugs, robbery, 4 abuse. 5 THE COURT: How long did the warrant come 6 into existence? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's been out for a 8 while, but I just recently found out it's still 9 existing. 10 THE COURT: Anything else? 11 Mr. Taveras, you started to say something. What's the relationship between you 12 13 and whoever was arrested or accused or convicted? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My mother's cousin, 15 he was charged drug dealing in New York City and 16 he be sentenced, but it's someone I see back home 17 when I was a teenager. 18 THE COURT: So he got a drug sentence in 19 New York? 2.0 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Did you ever visit him in 22 jail? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 24 THE COURT: Do you know whether he plead 25 guilty or the judge said guilty? =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

VOIR DIRE = 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe the jury. 2 THE COURT: Anybody else? 3 Last two questions. Anybody know anybody 4 who is or in the past was prosecuted by the 5 Manhattan District Attorney's office the entity 6 for which Mr. Berland works? 7 All right, you by the law have a chance 8 to ask questions. There is an actual specific 9 amount of time. They know, you need not. By law 10 the prosecution asks questions first. We'll hear 11 Mr. Berland's excellent questions. 12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BERLAND: My name is Jason Berland. I represent the People of the State of New York against Edward Green. My time is extremely limited. I will ask some you questions specifically and others I will skip over entirely. Do not be offended. The purposes of the jury selection is to ensure that all sides have a fair and impartial jury.

Ms. Shrijver, you said that your friend was raped by a stranger and this was reported? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. BERLAND: Was the culprit ever arrested?

> PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, he was.

	VOIR DIRE
1	MR. BERLAND: Ms. Wein, I think there was
2	some confusion when the questionnaires were being
3	turned over.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wanted to say
5	something else. I did serve on Civil Court. I
6	said no to criminal and Grand Jury, but I did
7	serve on civil.
8	MR. BERLAND: You understand that the
9	principles of law that's for the judge to tell you
10	are different in a criminal case?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
12	MR. BERLAND: Were you ever the victim of
13	a crime? I don't think you had an opportunity to
14	answer that question.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really a victim.
16	My pocketbook had been taken, but I think it was
17	because I wasn't holding on to it.
18	THE COURT: Wait a minute. New York has
19	a definition for everything related to court
20	processes. Being a victim means your stuff was
21	taken. There is no fault involved. There's no
22	reward for being a victim.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It wasn't a personal
24	confrontation

25

MR. BERLAND: Ms. Mitchell, you said you

—VOIR DIRE <del>—</del>

	1	have friends who are police officers in
	2	Westchester County. Are these close friends?
	3	THE COURT: You have to yell, because she
	4	loses her job if she doesn't take down every
	5	syllable and since she is responsible for
	6	countless number of people, it's upon all of us to
	7	ensure future employment.
	8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A neighbor and my
	9	godfather.
	10	MR. BERLAND: Your relationship with the
	11	two individuals affects your ability to be fair
	12	and impartial when police officers take the stand
-	13	in this case let me rephrase.
received.	14	Do you have a bias towards the police
	15	department based on that relationship?
	16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I like them.
	17	MR. BERLAND: Can all of you keep an open
	18	mind when you listen to the testimony of all the
	19	witnesses who take the stand on this case?
	20	PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.
	21	MR. BERLAND: Ms. Stubbendeck, Ph.D. in
	22	the history of violent gangs.
	23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Urban gangs.
	24	THE COURT: Are there peace-loving urban
	25	gangs?
nago par		YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

=VOIR DIRE =

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Also a difference. 2 THE COURT: Is that one of the community 3 activist things? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kind of a melting of 5 both of them. I study perceptions of gangs and 6 public policy. 7 MR. BERLAND: You've done research into 8 narcotics trafficking? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I haven't actually 10 felt that at all. 11 THE COURT: She speaks like an academic. 12 MR. BERLAND: As the judge has told all of you, the defendant is charged with possessing 13 14 more than half a kilogram of cocaine inside of an 15 apartment. Not talking about a couple small 16 Ziploc bags, talking about more than a pound of 17 cocaine. With that being said -- this is the 18 general question. 19 Is there anyone here who, for whatever 20 reason, generally believes the possession of 21 cocaine, no matter what the amount is, should be 22 legalized? 23 Mr. Perez you said your father was 24 convicted of a narcotics crime? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

=VOIR DIRE <del>--</del>

1	MR. BERLAND: Would that do you have
2	any ill will or feelings about the police, how
3	they handled any aspect of your father 's case?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't.
5	MR. BERLAND: When police officers are
6	going to take the stand, testify, you will sit
7	back and listen to them and their testimony solely
8	on what you hear about this case?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'll hear the
10	evidence and when the evidence is finished, I can
11	make my judgment.
12	MR. BERLAND: Mr. Wagner, I want to talk
13	about your DWI conviction. Did that go to trial?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was in Hawthorne,
15	New Jersey. The judge gave me the sentence.
16	MR. BERLAND: Did any police officer, I
17	am assuming they did, testify?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They did.
19	MR. BERLAND: Do you have ill will
20	towards police officers in general because of your
21	experience?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
23	MR. BERLAND: So you will be able to keep
24	an open mind and listen to the police officers in
25	this case fairly and impartially?
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

—VOIR DIRE <del>-</del>

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
2	MR. BERLAND: You're sure.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm positive.
4	MR. BERLAND: Ms. Sullivan, you said you
5	were very young and your father was convicted of a
6	drug crime. Would that affect your ability to sit
7	on a case where the charge here is possession of a
8	large quantity of cocaine?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
10	MR. BERLAND: Are you sure?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
12	MR. BERLAND: You said your brother's in
13	the 17th Precinct?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15	MR. BERLAND: Rookie?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
17	MR. BERLAND: Are you close with your
18	brother?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so.
20	MR. BERLAND: Do you speak a lot to him
21	about his job?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really.
23	MR. BERLAND: Would that relationship
24	affect your ability to keep an open mind?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will be impartial.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

### -VOIR DIRE -

1	MR. BERLAND: Ms. Wicker, you were robbed
2	in your apartment?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Home.
4	MR. BERLAND: How many years ago?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five.
6	MR. BERLAND: I think you said the
7	intruder was never captured?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
9	MR. BERLAND: You reported it to the
10	police?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
12	MR. BERLAND: How do you feel the police
13	handled the investigation?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good.
15	MR. BERLAND: No lack of effort on their
16	part that no one was caught?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
18	MR. BERLAND: Ms. Pinker, you said you'd
19	like to go back to school to become a teacher.
20	What do you want to teach?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Elementary schools,
22	fifth or sixth graders.
23	MR. BERLAND: Mr. Caba, I didn't hear you
24	when you stated where you currently work.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maintenance.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENTOR COURT REDORTED

# -VOIR DIRE -

1	THE COURT: You have seven minutes.
2	MR. BERLAND: Left or into it?
3	THE COURT: There's not much difference.
4	MR. BERLAND: Your friends you said
5	you had friends more than one convicted of a drug
6	crime?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Brother-in-law
8	is in prison.
9	MR. BERLAND: Did you go watch any of the
10	court proceedings in those cases?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
12	MR. BERLAND: Will those representations
13	affect your ability to distance yourself and say
14	this is a drug trial, but has nothing do with
15	it?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
17	MR. BERLAND: No, you will not be fair.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not affect me.
19	MR. BERLAND: No problem?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21	MR. BERLAND: Mr. Taveras, same question
22	to you.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am a perceptive
24	fellow.
25	THE COURT: He has no problem.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER —

τ	t 🔿 -	T D	ъ.	<b>-</b>	
—∨	'()	I K	1)	ΙKΗ	١

1 Family members convicted of MR. BERLAND: 2 a drug crime? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 4 MR. BERLAND: Would that affect your 5 ability to be fair and impartial? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 7 MR. BERLAND: Are you sure? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I am. 9 MR. BERLAND: I will wrap it up. 10 judge briefly touched on this. There are people 11 who, for a variety of reasons, might be 12 uncomfortable of returning a verdict guilty. 13 know Ms. Sullivan told us she's in human resources 14 and has to make decisions whether to hire or fire 15 people. 16 I can undoubtedly tell you the decision 17 in this case, whether or not you find the 18 defendant guilty or not guilty, will be a 19 difficult decision. 20 Anyone here for any religious reasons, 21 political beliefs or moral reasons will not be 22 able to say the words guilty if I prove this case, 23 the elements beyond a reasonable doubt? 24

This is my last or my only chance to speak with you one-on-one. I need to know if

25

<del>-</del>VOIR DIRE=

there is anything that will prevent you from saying the words guilty if the case is proven beyond a reasonable doubt? Anyone here that feels that way?

Do you know weather when you go to a wedding whether the priest or rabbi, says speak now or forever hold your peace? This is it.

Anything else that I should know, the defendant should know that isn't covered in the questionnaire?

I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Keith.

MR. KEITH: I want to make sure I get the names right. Again, my name is Arnold Keith. I represent Edward Green. As you know, this case is a drug case. He's being accused of possessing a fair amount of narcotics.

Is there anybody here, based on what they've heard so far, anyone here made any decisions about this case?

Can you all promise me that you will follow the legal instructions that are given to you by Justice McLaughlin and put aside any personal feelings you have about the law, that you will follow the law that he gives to you? Can you

VOIR DIRE = 1 all promise me that you will do that if you are 2 picked to serve on this jury? Nobody has a 3 problem with that concept? 4 Now, I want to ask a few of you some 5 individual questions. 6 Ms. Mitchell, I will start with you. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ι appreciate and understand you like police officers. Is that fair to say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: You have relatives that are police officers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Friends.

MR. KEITH: Would you agree with me that of the 30,000 or so New York City police officers that there might be a few that you might not like? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: With regards to your evaluation of testimony that you may hear in this case, can you assure me that you will evaluate a police officer's testimony the same way you would the testimony of someone else? Do you think you will be able to do that?

> PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um --

THE COURT: You just hesitated. This is a tough question because there is an unfamiliar

•VOIR DIRE = 1 thing she's being asked. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The only reason I 3 hesitate is because I think I hold police officers 4 in a higher regard. 5 THE COURT: Are you open to the 6 possibility that any witness, but now he's 7 specifically asking regarding them, including a 8 police officer, could lie, exaggerate, be mistaken 9 or tell the truth? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Actually sit here and then 12 not tell the truth. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Can you repeat the 14 question? 15 THE COURT: Sure. 16 Are you open to the possibility that a 17 police officer will come here and purposely lie to 18 you folks? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 20 THE COURT: Well then, have a nice day. 21 You cannot sit here. Have a nice day.

22

23

24

25

Not to think that you are running a nonsensical system, what just happened is the following. If you are on the street and you are lost and you ask a police officer how do you get

-VOIR DIRE =

to the Carnegie Hall and a police officer says you take the number 7 up to whatever it is, 50th

Street and walk a little bit, you really would have to be a bizarre individual, having heard what the cop said about the directions, to say to yourself, I wonder if she was lying to me. You just wouldn't do that. You would get on the subway and find yourself to Carnegie Hall.

In a courtroom, though, when somebody says something, whether it is the police or nonpolice, your job is to scrutinize, examine. If you accept it, it's fine. If you reject it, that's fine.

She, apparently, could not conceive the possibility that a police officer would perjure himself. She could not sit here. She made up her mind that a certain set of facts could not happen. I'm not suggesting that it is or isn't going to happen, but she cannot be here.

Go ahead.

MR. KEITH: The testimony in this case, the overwhelming majority of the testimony will come from police officers. As the judge has indicated, we're asking you to have an open mind, and to fairly evaluate, fairly and impartially

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

-VOIR DIRE =

evaluate the testimony and the evidence that you will hear in this case if you are selected.

Mr. Wysock, your uncle is a retired police officer. Can you assure me if you are selected as a juror, that you will carefully evaluate what you are told, listen for the inconsistencies, the consistencies, the specificity, the lack of specificity and make a decision in the end after instructed on the law by the judge?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: You can assure me you can have an open mind and listen to the testimony and give Mr. Green a fair trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: Mr. Caba, I believe you indicated that you have three police officer friends. Can you make the same assurances to me, that Mr. Green will get a fair trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: I have to ask you a couple of other questions. You work as a maintenance man in a residential building; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: Do you repair things?

# —VOIR DIRE —

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
2	MR. KEITH: Do you ever have occasion to
3	go into a person's apartment.
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
5	MR. KEITH: On those occasions, are there
6	times when you have to go into a person's
7	apartment and the person isn't home?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sometimes.
9	MR. KEITH: Moving on. Mr. Taveras, I
10	believe you indicated that you work as a handyman
11	in a commercial building?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
13	MR. KEITH: Do you repair things?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15	MR. KEITH: I guess in a commercial
16	building you go into offices sometimes?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
18	MR. KEITH: Sometimes you go into offices
19	not occupied by the person who works there?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Most of the time they
21	have to be there.
22	MR. KEITH: Ms. Johnson, do you have a
23	cousin who is a retired police officer?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
25	MR. KEITH: Can you assure me that if you
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

-VOIR DIRE =

get a chance to evaluate the testimony of a police officer in this case, that you will give Mr. Green a fair trial and listen carefully, evaluate what the officer says?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: Mr. Ryan, your brother is brand-new on the job. Can you make the same assurance?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.

MR. KEITH: I can tell.

Now, under the law, my client is presumed innocent. Basic principles of American criminal law. Does anybody have a problem with that concept?

Does anybody have a problem with the idea that he doesn't have to say anything, doesn't have to do anything? It's the People's burden to try to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Can you all accept that legal principle? Anyone who has a problem with that?

There will be other legal concepts, including those concepts further described by Justice McLaughlin. I ask you to promise me if you are selected as a juror in this case, that you will accept the legal principles in this courtroom

-YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

=VOIR DIRE =

1	unequivocally, no matter what your personal
2	'beliefs are. Can everyone promise me that?
3	You will hear the definition of
4	possession and dominion and control. These things
5	will be explained to you by the judge. I'm asking
6	you to follow the legal instructions that you get
7	in this case unequivocally. Anyone have a problem
8	with that?
9	Mr. Daniels, I believe you served before
10	on a criminal case; it was a drug case?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
12	MR. KEITH: You also indicated that after
13	the case, you didn't speak to the lawyers or the
14	judge.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, we just left.
16	MR. KEITH: I know it's a similar type of
17	case, you would think the same laws would apply.
18	I'm asking you, sir, if you are selected on this
19	case, you follow this judge's instructions. Can
20	you do that?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
22	MR. KEITH: Mr. Perez, were you present
23	for your father's trial?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I was.
25	MR KETTH. It was a judgo trial go you

VOIR DIRE =

1

2

4

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

didn't hear any legal instructions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They were introducing the evidence.

THE COURT: Was there a jury like this group?

> PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

MR. KEITH: Mr. Haile, you indicated that you've been arrested before, and you've been accused by the police before. So if you were to serve on this jury, we, both myself and the prosecutor and the judge, we need you to be fair and impartial to both sides.

Can you assure us that if you are selected, you will listen to the police officer testimony, hear what they have to say, and decide, after hearing all the evidence and hearing the judge's instructions on the law, can you promise me you can do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: Do you think having been accused by the police so many times, that you can be fair and give the prosecutor a fair trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR:

MR. KEITH: Can you give my client, Mr. Green, a fair trial, and hold them to their =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

=VOIR DIRE =

burden of proof?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Couple more minutes.

MR. KEITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Don't get carried away.

MR. KEITH: Ms. Sullivan, I understand that your father was a drug addict, and you understand that Mr. Green is being accused of drug possession. Is there anything about those facts that would affect your ability to be a fair juror on this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'd have to hear the facts.

MR. KEITH: Well, we are going to hear that he was in a room and in a closet and couple of safes in that room there was a bunch of drugs. Can you give him a fair trial? He is accused of possession of drugs.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. KEITH: Ladies and gentlemen, the issue in this case is going to be real simple. The defense is going to be really simple.

Basically, wrong place, wrong time. All I am asking you to do, if selected as a juror, I need an assurance from all that you keep an open mind,

-VOIR DIRE:

that you follow Judge McLaughlin's instructions on the law, and you listen carefully to what the police officers have to say about the evidence and information that they were involved in on the day in question.

Can all of you promise that if you are selected, that you will do that?

Has anybody heard anything so far this morning that thinks they cannot be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

Thank you.

THE COURT: Different instructions for different groups of people now. Of the people who are prospective jurors, how many of you routinely at work will get a two-hour lunch? All right. Upon your promise that you will not think this is routine, that's what you are going to get because this is not the only case I have to deal with before I deal with the jury again.

You folks I'm going to ask to stay because the lawyers and Mr. Green and I will make decisions regarding you folks. The prospective jurors, I will tell you a time to be outside the room, not to walk through the door, but be available to us. The time is 2:30. I have given

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

### =VOIR DIRE =

you a schedule.

2.3

Next Monday or Tuesday you will decide the case. I'm here until 2012. My guess is none of you want to be here past next week. If you come back at a quarter of three or 3:15, I don't care.

Under the rules, they go back about 8025 years, I have to wait and your fellow citizens have to wait, so don't keep us waiting.

We'll let you know who among you have been selected and then given further instructions once we make the decisions. When the flock has left, you can leave.

COURT OFFICER: The prospective juror wants to say something to you not in front of the other prospective jurors.

THE COURT: Come on up.

(Whereupon, a sidebar conference was held on the record out of the hearing of the jury.)

THE COURT: Hi. Under the rules, a private conversation basically is with the lawyers and myself.

What do you want to say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was always told what to say, but as I grew up, I found a way not to discriminate against. Since my father has the

#### <del>--</del>VOIR DIRE=

same charges as him and other charges, I don't know how to relate as I got older. I was brainwashed.

THE COURT: Brainwashed in what presence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: By lawyers, my mother
to tell me what to say. Now that I have my own
opinion, I understand things now. It's like I'm
half and half.

THE COURT: You haven't gotten over the brainwashing yet?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have, but I'm still maybe I should say the right thing, maybe I should say what I've been told, my own opinion.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied that you did tell us your own opinion?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did tell my own opinion.

THE COURT: Do you think you will be able to give your truthful opinion in the jury room?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, but I feel something will overtake, say I'll change my mind during the process.

THE COURT: Change your mind for a bad reason or okay reason?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Both.

-VOIR DIRE =

1 THE COURT: What kind of bad reason? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Like I'll think I 3 don't think this is correct, I don't think this is 4 correct. 5 THE COURT: Well, maybe we should excuse 6 you. 7 Do you want to ask her some questions? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There's still the 9 warrant out. So it's like every year it's 10 something different. Every year, new charges. 11 MR. KEITH: I don't want to put you on 12 the spot. 13 THE COURT: I do. 14 MR. KEITH: I guess we do in so many 15 words. This is now about Mr. Green. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know. 17 MR. KEITH: You will hear testimony from 18 police officers, and part of the process is to 19 make decisions, to evaluate from what you hear in 20 this courtroom and that's all we ask you to do. 21 Do you think you can do it? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know I can. In the 23 back of my mind, I will have a gut feeling. 24 MR. KEITH: You will take it out on 25 Mr. Green or out on the prosecution?

Since I

VOIR DIRE = 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Honestly, I don't 2 know until we're in the process. 3 THE COURT: I don't know whether she's 4 comfortable that she can make whatever decision 5 she's going to make and not be worried that either 6 she made a wrong one or that before it's actually 7 made, she will change. 8 Do you feel uncomfortable to do whatever 9 is required? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When I heard the 11 address, it doesn't bother since that's the exact 12 place where I live, doesn't bother me. Now that 13 he told me exactly what happened, I don't know if 14 it was he said, she said. 15 MR. KEITH: It's drugs. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Wrong place, wrong 17 time. 18 That's my defense. MR. KEITH: 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah I know. 20 heard his defense, I didn't know that before. 21 Since that's what I heard, like, I don't know. 22 THE COURT: He's not a witness. 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know. 24

25

THE COURT: You have to decide on what happens here. Can you hold off judgment? Ιf YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

-VOIR DIRE

there weren't something to be said, we wouldn't be having a trial. You have to make a decision about something. Can you wait to see or you are just so uncomfortable about your ability to do this?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not uncomfortable. Don't want to make the wrong mistake during the time. I can't tell you during the time.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. KEITH: No further questions.

THE COURT: Why don't you wait outside.

Do you want to say anything?

MR. KEITH: Sounds like that is a part of the deliberations process. I don't necessarily see that she has to be excused.

MR. BERLAND: I respectfully disagree. I think there's cause.

THE COURT: I was here, I watched it, I saw her. If there is a situation where I'm making a mistake in excusing one disqualified juror for another one, so be it. She cannot make a decision. She's excused.

MR. BERLAND: Any cause challenges? I just excused number three. Any cause challenges on the first 14 seats, the first 12 people?

MR. BERLAND: Through Ms. Johnson, no.

### 118 VOIR DIRE 1 THE COURT: Cause on the defense? 2 MR. KEITH: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Peremptory by the People, first 12 people? 4 5 MR. BERLAND: No, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Defense. 7 MR. KEITH: May I have a moment with my 8 client? 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. KEITH: The defense would like to 11 exercise challenges as to juror number one, 12 Ms. Shrijver; juror two, Wein; juror five, Cole; 13 juror number nine, Pinker; juror ten, Wicker; 14 juror 11, Ms. Sullivan. I think we have five 15 jurors; is that correct? 16 THE COURT: Potentially, we have six. You 17 have not said a thing about 12, 13 and 14. 18 MR. KEITH: They are okay. 19 THE COURT: Then we have six. 20 MR. KEITH: I'm sorry, juror number eight 21 we exercise a challenge on. 22 THE COURT: Hall.

23

24

25

Carvin is one, Stubbendeck is two, Riley is three, Wagner is four, Johnson is five.

On the next six, any cause by the People? =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER 🚃

<del>--</del>Voir dire=

1 MR. BERLAND: I want to qualify that Caba 2 is 17 and Taveras is 20. 3 THE COURT: Daniels is 17, Caba is 18. 4 MR. BERLAND: Wysock is 19. 5 THE COURT: Wysock is 19. 6 MR. BERLAND: Cause to number 15, 7 Mr. Haile. Although he stated that he could be 8 fair and impartial, in light of the fact nine to 9 10 narcotics conviction, I don't see that was 10 possible. 11 THE COURT: Maybe he pled quilty because 12 he was guilty and they didn't want to waste 13 anybody's time. 14 MR. BERLAND: That is always a potential, 15 Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Did you finish your 17 application? 18 MR. BERLAND: That's it. 19 THE COURT: Denied. The very thing for 2.0 which and about which peremptories were created, 21 all three of them, unfortunately here we have 20. 22 Any cause by the defense? 23 MR. KEITH: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: People's position 25 peremptorily.

-VOIR DIRE -

1	MR. BERLAND: Number 15, Mr. Haile,
2	number 16, Perez and number 18, Mr. Caba. That's
3	it.
4	THE COURT: And the defense would opt to
5	do what?
6	MR. KEITH: Your Honor, we challenge
7	Mr. Daniels, juror number 17.
8	THE COURT: The other two are okay?
9	MR. KEITH: Yes, sir.
10	THE COURT: Dr. Wysock, juror number six
11	and Mr. Taveras, juror number seven.
12	Bring in everybody, please.
13	COURT OFFICER: Panel entering.
14	THE COURT: Thank you for being patient.
15	As is always the case, some have been selected,
16	some have not been. If you have not been chosen,
17	it's not a reflection as a human being. Your
18	friends and family will still love you whether you
19	are on a case or not.
20	Tell them who has been excused and who
21	remains.
22	THE CLERK: Following jurors remain in
23	your seat. If I do not call your name, you are
24	excused, and report back to room 1517.
25	Timothy Carvin. Megan Stubbendeck,
	n e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

<u>-YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER = </u>

-VOIR DIRE =

David Riley, Michael Wagner, Gerforne Johnson,
James Wysock, and Rafael Taveras. If you heard
your name, remain seated. If you are excused, go
back to the central jury room at 2:15. We'll send
your ballots down there.

Are the remaining people satisfactory to the prosecution?

MR. BERLAND: Yes.

THE COURT: To the defense?

MR. KEITH: Yes.

THE COURT: Stand up and take the oath, please.

THE CLERK: Raise your right hand.

Do you swear or affirm to try the case of the People of the State of New York versus Edward Green in a fair and impartial manner, and to the best of your ability render a true verdict according to the law and evidence.

JURORS: Yes.

THE COURT: I do not need you for the rest of the day. Need you at 9:45 tomorrow. Go with the sergeant or officer, give them what they need, take the identification card from them. Please be available because we're little ahead of schedule. We'll finish it this afternoon and start

the trial at 9:45 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, a lunch recess was taken, after which the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Sorry it took a few minutes longer. We're almost ready. Once everybody comes in, we'll call 20 more people and do another round and probably pick a jury this afternoon.

Call 20 more people, please.

one. Beth Steinberg, seat number two. Anna
Torres seat, number three. Lisee August, seat
number four. Steven Dunford, seat number five.
Helen Sher, seat number six. Grant Makarian, seat
number seven. Andrew Wah, seat number eight.
Khalid Akbar, seat number nine. Denise Ward, seat
number ten. Shannon Paulson, seat number 11.
Anna Gjika, seat number 12. Penny Gibson, seat
number 13. Patricia Crystal, seat number 14.
Danillo Antonio, seat number 15. Nathaniel
Higgins, seat number 16. Brenda Rojas, seat
number 17. Robert Jenkins, seat number 18. Donald
Keister, seat number 19. Cornelia O'Connor, seat
number 20.

THE COURT: Those of you who will ultimately be jurors and appearing here for

-VOIR DIRE

several days should understand that the temperature in this room fluctuates from 40 to 80 and the transition can take place within an hour, and so perhaps with a little bit of hyperbole I urge jurors to wear bathing suits under down coats in order to deal with the temperature fluctuations.

I will change the rule a little bit for the second round, which you will be pleased which will take will time because the lawyers have less time this time, but also because of this rule change.

When your turn comes, if there's something that might potentially disqualify you, mention that right away. It does not necessarily disqualify you, but for example we had Ms. Stuart this morning said that she lived within three blocks from where this event took place. That's the sort of thing that might disqualify her. I'm not going to give you examples.

If there is something that might disqualify you, mention it right away. It doesn't mean automatically you will not be here, but if it winds up excusing you, it's better to do it early than late.

### ---VOIR DIRE =

1	Go ahead, Ms. Cabrera.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born I was
3	born
4	THE COURT: It's like listening to my
5	radio which doesn't work too well.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born here in
7	New York City. I have lived here 19 years, all my
8	life
9	THE COURT: This will be speech class.
10	We're going to do it as we never heard of these
11	things. As a leader, I'll do the same thing, let's
12	go. I'm the only one who wants to be here
13	till 2012. Tell us about yourself in accordance
14	with the questionnaire.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born here in
16	New York City. I lived here 19 years, my whole
17	life. I have about 15 to 20 relatives that live
18	here in the city. Am not married. I work. I'm a
19	mail processor.
20	THE COURT: You process the people of the
21	male gender?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mail as in postage
23	mail.
24	THE COURT: How do you do that?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's a DVD company
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ———————————————————————————————————

and we mail -- receive and mail out DVDs to the right people.

THE COURT: Continue.

2.0

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have any children. I have a high school diploma and some college background. I have never served in a civil, criminal or Grand Jury. I never served in the military. I have no close friends or family members that have worked in law enforcement. None of my relatives or friends have been victims of a crime. I've never been a party to a civil lawsuit. Yes, I would follow the law as the Court instructs me and I will be fair and impartial. I live in Midtown Manhattan.

THE COURT: Anything else we should know? No. Then we'll go to Ms. Steinberg.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in Los Angeles. Lived in New York and Los Angeles for the last eight years. I have a couple of cousins who live in New York. I was married. Currently living with my boyfriend. I am an investment banker. My boyfriend is an investment banker, we do not have any children. I am a college graduate. Never served on a civil, criminal or any other jury. Never served in the military. I was held up at

	126
	VOIR DIRE
1	gunpoint 10 years ago.
2	THE COURT: In Los Angeles?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In Los Angeles.
4	THE COURT: During that robbery, was
5	there more than one robber?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Two robbers.
7	THE COURT: One gun, one knife?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Two guns.
9	THE COURT: Did you report that event to
10	the police?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Continue.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have never been a
14	party to a civil lawsuit or in court for any
15	reason. I will follow the law to the best of my
16	ability. I live in the West Village. I had a
17	college roommate who OD'd on cocaine.
18	THE COURT: Died?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Did not die.
20	THE COURT: Cocaine, heroin or do you
21	know the substance?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Cocaine.
23	THE COURT: Do you live west or east of
24	Hudson Street?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: East of Hudson

=YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

25

	127
	VOIR DIRE————
1	Street.
2	THE COURT: That's my own personal survey
3	of what constitutes the West Village. Anything
4	else we need to know?
5	Ms. Torres.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I speaking a little
7	bit, not too much.
8	THE COURT: All right. This would be a
9	problem. What do you do for a living? How do you
10	make money?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Work.
12	THE COURT: What work do you do?
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I baby-sitting.
14	THE COURT: Are the babies under two
15	years old?
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three.
17	THE COURT: Doesn't speak English,
18	Spanish at all?
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She speaking English.
20	THE COURT: Little bit?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
22	THE COURT: How much of what I said have
23	you not understood?



THE COURT: How much of what I have said

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Tell me again.

-VOIR DIRE -

1	did you not understand? Do you understand?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand
3	THE COURT: I'll tell you what, practice
4	talking with the three-year old as he gets older
5	and come back here in a couple of years. You're
6	excused for now.
7	Fill seat number three.
8	THE CLERK: Amy Wigler, seat number
9	three.
10	THE COURT: Thank you for trying,
11	Ms. Torres.
12	Ms. Wigler.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in Detroit. I've
14	lived in New York City for ten years. I have four
15	relatives living in New York City. I'm married. I
16	work in entertainment.
17	THE COURT: What does that mean?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do marketing for an
19	entertainment company, MTV Networks.
20	MR. KEITH: What is it she does?
21	THE COURT: She does marketing for MTV
22	Networks that purportedly entertains me.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband is a
24	rabbi.
25	THE COURT: She should stop there. If
[	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER —

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

=VOIR DIRE =

there anybody who was a minister or spouse or companion of a minister, I ask the following questions. You heard me say a couple of times that you have to follow New York 's law. Sometimes New York's law and a person's moral or ethical or philosophical code, religious beliefs differ. You heard me say that you have to follow New York's law. That means, that if there were, I don't see it happening in this case, if there were a moral difference between your view of something and New York's view of something, you'd be required to follow me or leave. Do you potentially have any problem like that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do have a baby at home.

> THE COURT: Small baby?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, ten months. I'm a college graduate. I've never served on a jury of any sort. Never served in the military. I don't know anyone from law enforcement agency. I do have a close friend who has been a victim of a violent crime.

> THE COURT: What happened to him or her? YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

	VOIR DIRE
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mugged, attacked and
2	kidnapped.
3	THE COURT: Survived but injured?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Injured seriously.
5	THE COURT: Hospitalized?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hospitalized.
7	THE COURT: Recovered?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: In New York?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In New York.
11	THE COURT: Within the last five years?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
13	THE COURT: Anybody arrested as far as
14	you know?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
16	THE COURT: Continue.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've never been a
18	party to a civil lawsuit. Given I would be
19	fair and impartial. I live on the Upper West Side.
20	THE COURT: Anything else?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a friend who
22	recently overdosed on cocaine.
23	THE COURT: Died?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I would be fair
25	and impartial.
	l l

	133
	VOIR DIRE —
1	THE COURT: You satisfied you could be
2	fair notwithstanding that?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. The death was in
4	the City of New York borough of Manhattan?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Recently.
6	THE COURT: Funeral happen?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Within the last month?
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
10	THE COURT: How do you know it was
11	cocaine?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was told it was.
13	THE COURT: You are satisfied you can do
14	this?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
16	THE COURT: Next is Ms. August.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in New York
18	City. Lived here for 43 years, my whole live
19	life. Three relatives in New York City. I'm
20	married. I work. I'm a primary care giver at a
21	company that I design and manufacturer. My High
22	School is in commercial real estate. I have two
23	kids. I'm a college graduate.

25

THE COURT: How old?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nine.

# -VOIR DIRE -

1	THE COURT: Speak yet about drugs?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have. I have
3	served on a criminal jury.
4	THE COURT: Don't tell me the verdict,
5	but what was the charge, if you recall?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Robbery.
7	THE COURT: A face-to-face confrontation?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yea.
9	THE COURT: More than one person or just
10	one?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just one.
12	About 20 years ago.
13	THE COURT: Did anyone speak to you after
14	you reached the verdict, such as judge or lawyers?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
16	THE COURT: Continue.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have never served
18	on a Grand Jury. Never served in the military.
19	Neither I or anybody I know ever served in law
20	enforcement. I have been the victim of a crime.
21	My brother-in-law recently, last week, was
22	involved in a crime.
23	THE COURT: What happened?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was in the bank
25	and the bank was held up at gunpoint in Boston.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENTOR COURT REPORTER

—VOIR DIRE —

1	THE COURT: Were guns fired?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know if shots
3	were fired. It's being investigated by the FBI
4	right now.
5	THE COURT: What happened to you?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My apartment was
7	burglarized.
8	THE COURT: Were you home when it
9	happened?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
11	THE COURT: Did you report it?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I reported it.
13	THE COURT: You spoke with the police?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: As far as you know, was
16	anybody arrested?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nothing has happened.
18	THE COURT: Continue.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have never been a
20	party to a civil lawsuit or in court for any other
21	reason. I would be fair and impartial. Able to
22	be fair and impartial, I believe. I live in the
23	Upper East Side.
24	THE COURT: Anything else we should know?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER ———————————————————————————————————

	VOIR DIRE
1	THE COURT: Mr. Dunford.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in
3	Bermuda. I have lived in New York for three
4	years.
5	THE COURT: U.S. citizen?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: No relatives in New York
8	City. Not married. I'm work with a design
9	company and handbag company. I don't have any
10	children. I have a college education. I've never
11	served in a criminal jury or jury or verdict or
12	anything like that. Never did Grand Jury. Never
13	did military service. I have an uncle who's a
14	judge, but haven't talked to him in the last two
15	or three years.
16	THE COURT: He might be lonely.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've been part of a
18	crime. Gotten bashed in the head with a thing or
19	two.
20	THE COURT: Were you hurt when you were
21	bashed?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, in my 'hood,
23	Spanish Harlem.
24	THE COURT: Were you bashed by more than
25	one person?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

135 •VOIR DIRE = PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was one time. It was an object that someone threw at me. That's how I have this scar. Never a party of a lawsuit. think I can be fair and impartial. THE COURT: What does "I think" mean? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have friends who have done drugs. I never done anything. I'm pretty compliant with them, so it's okay. I'm currently -- I live in Spanish Harlem, but I'm moving to Washington Heights. THE COURT: Your friends do some drugs? A lot of drugs? A lot of your friends do a lot drugs? PROSPECTIVE JUROR:

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Six degrees of separation is a more or less amount. For me, once every year or so.

THE COURT: Since that's illegal and I gather you've seen them doing it and it doesn't grow on trees.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have no clue. Don't want to know. That's about it.

THE COURT: This gentleman is accused of possessing a certain amount of drugs. Your friends possessed a certain amount of drugs.

Nobody would ask you to assess your friend's

### -VOIR DIRE-

situation, but are you in a position of worrying about them, but for some fortuitous circumstance, perhaps your friends might be.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Can you decide this case without imagining your friends there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I'm fine.

THE COURT: If you are fine, I'm fine.

Anything else we need to know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Everything is a little blurry from here on. I just had laser surgery. I can read kind of.

THE COURT: Part of the assessment of witnesses has to do with looking at them and gauging whatever you can glean from how they appear. Do you think it will clear up by tomorrow?

THE COURT: What has the doctor told you?

I hope so.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have my

PROSPECTIVE JUROR:

appointment -- they put a contact on your eye.

It's kind of protected. They'll take it out and it will be clear.

THE COURT: How will you be a juror if you are not here tomorrow?

11

14

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

16 17

19

18

2021

22

23

24

25

=VOIR DIRE =

the day.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Can't have a juror who might not be able to see the witnesses. You're excused.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Karachi, Pakistan. I have lived in the U.S. for 27 years. I've lived in New York for three years. Live in New Jersey prior to that. I have three relatives in New York City. I'm married. I'm genetic counselor and I run a center for prenatal pediatrics for women in pregnancy with human anomalies. My husband is in business school. We have no children. I have a Master's in human genetics. I never served on a criminal or civil jury, never Grand Jury. Never been in the military. I don't have any close relatives or friends employed by law enforcement agency. I don't have any close relative or friends ever been a victim of a crime. I've never been a party to a civil lawsuit or in court for any reason. I do believe I will follow the law as the Court instructs. I live on the Upper West Side.

THE COURT: Anything else?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Sher.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I have an adult child who was a drug addict.

## —VOIR DIRE—

1	THE COURT: You don't think this is a
2	good idea?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not sure.
4	THE COURT: You're excused. Sorry you had
5	to say that in public.
6	Fill seat number six.
7	THE CLERK: Sarah Wardrop, seat number
8	six.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in Ontario,
10	Canada. U.S. citizen.
11	THE COURT: Duel?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Do you fight?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What's that?
15	THE COURT: It's what I do, and have.
16	After lunch it's more difficult to keep people
17	focused out there, so there might be a little more
18	of the idiocy in the afternoon than in the
L9	morning.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Lived in New York
21	City three years. One relative in the city. Not
22	married. I work in radio. I don't have any
23	children.
24	THE COURT: What do you do in radio?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Producer and on air
1	

	VOIR DIRE————
1	host.
2	THE COURT: Public affairs, comedy?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Music radio.
4	THE COURT: Go ahead.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: College. Never served
6	on any kind of jury or the military. Don't have
7	friends or relatives who work in law enforcement.
8	I've been the victim of identity theft.
9	THE COURT: Is that situation over with
10	or not?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not over with.
12	THE COURT: Knock on wood means, yes,
13	it's over.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hoping it's over.
15	THE COURT: In what state did you
16	experience the problem?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was while I was
18	currently living in New York City, but happened in
19	Chicago.
20	THE COURT: Did it require police to get
21	involved? Was it store security?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There was a police
23	report filed.
24	THE COURT: Continue.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My sister was the
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

=VOIR DIRE=

victim of a robbery. Never a party to a civil 1 lawsuit or in court for any other reason. 2 Ι 3 believe I will follow the law as the Court 4 instructs and will be fair and impartial. 5 in Inwood. 6 THE COURT: Anything else? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 8 THE COURT: Next is Mr. Makarian. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in a Avenium (phonetic). Former Soviet Socialist 10 11 Republic country. I lived in New York City 12 for 30 years. I have about five relatives in New York City. I'm married. Working as a commodities 13 14 trader. My spouse is an attorney. I have two 15 kids. 16 THE COURT: How old are your children? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They are 13 and 18 three. 19 THE COURT: Have you spoken to 20 the 13-year-old about drugs? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You bet. 22 THE COURT: Have you spoken to the 23 three-year old about drugs? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Almost. Starting it. 25 College degree. Never served in criminal jury.

-VOIR DIRE -

1 Never served on a Grand Jury as well. Haven't served in the military. I have a friend in 2 3 California who is a judge, and friends who are 4 police officers. 5 THE COURT: Where do the police officers 6 work? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Westchester County. 8 THE COURT: Any of them do principally 9 drug enforcement? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sheriff. I'm victim of a homicide. My father was shot in New York 11 12 City. 13 THE COURT: Do you remember what kind of 14 event? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a funeral and 16 was attending with my mother. He tried to correct 17 a disturbance and he was called out and shot 18 twice. 19 THE COURT: How long ago was that? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: This was 1985. 21 THE COURT: Was anybody arrested? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Do you know what happened to 24 that case? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

# <del>-</del>VOIR DIRE -

1	THE COURT: Are you satisfied with what
2	happened to that case?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really.
4	THE COURT: How is that going to affect
5	you here?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know.
7	THE COURT: You are excused. Please step
8	out.
9	Fill seat number seven.
10	THE CLERK: Ardelia Leonardo, seat number
11	seven.
12	THE COURT: I'm not going to criticize
13	somebody whose father was shot and killed. That's
14	the sort of thing and a lot less than that that
15	you should mention right away if there's something
16	that might disqualify you.
17	Ms. Leonardo, go ahead.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Dominican. Born
19	Dominican Republic. I live like seven years. I
20	know like 20 people.
21	THE COURT: Twenty people relatives here?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Around my
23	neighborhood. I not married. I working.
24	THE COURT: What do you do?
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sale.
	VVFTTF PACHECO SENTOR COURT REPORTER

	143
	VOIR DIRE
1	THE COURT: Sales?
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
3	THE COURT: What do you sell?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Furniture.
5	THE COURT: Is it easier to sell tables
6	or chairs?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Chairs. I don't have
8	children. I never been over here.
9	THE COURT: Not bad right? Meet some
10	nice people?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay, yeah.
12	THE COURT: Have you served on a Grand
13	Jury?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
15	THE COURT: This will be a Grand Jury,
16	but it's not a Grand Jury. It's a grand group of
17	folks. No, you haven't been on one, I can tell.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, my brother is
19	undercover.
20	THE COURT: How long has he been a police
21	officer?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Like 20 years.
23	THE COURT: You are his little sister?
24	Continue. Nobody has taken your property, stole

YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

anything from you?

25

=VOTR	DIBE
A O T I I	· DINE

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
2	THE COURT: Have you ever been in court
3	at all?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: This is the first
5	time.
6	THE COURT: Can you be fair here?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
8	THE COURT: In what neighborhood do you
9	live?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Washington Heights.
11	THE COURT: Anything else we should know?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Wah.
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in New York
15	City. Lived here my whole life. Ten relatives.
16	Single. I work. Venture capital. I have no
17	children. I have a graduate degree. I've never
18	been on a jury. Never been in the military. I
19	don't have any friends in law enforcement. I was
20	the victim of a crime.
21	THE COURT: What happened?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Carjacked
23	about 12 years ago in the city.
24	THE COURT: Why do you think that
25	happened? Wrong place wrong time?
L	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER

<del></del>	V	0	I	R	D	T	R	F.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If you consider 75th
2	and Park the wrong place?
3	THE COURT: Were you physically hurt?
4	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
5	THE COURT: As far as you know, was
6	anybody arrested?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
8	THE COURT: Continue.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been a party
10	to civil suits.
11	THE COURT: Roughly how many times?
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Four or five.
13	THE COURT: During time the cases were
L 4	ongoing, were you ever questioned by the other
L5	side's lawyer?
L6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. During
L7	depositions.
L8	THE COURT: Did it seem as if your word
L9	was being challenged or did they want additional
20	information?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Both.
22	THE COURT: During the course of a
23	litigation people get challenged and you're likely
24	to see that here.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I'm sure I can
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER —

## ──VOIR DIRE ─

1	be impartial. I live in Tribeca.
2	THE COURT: Anything else we should know?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Higgins.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in the Bronx.
6	Currently live in Harlem. I've been in New York
7	City all my life.
8	THE COURT: Do you live within three
9	blocks of Lenox and 132nd?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I have about 15
11	relatives in the city. Not married. Working,
12	consultant, fund raising marketing.
13	THE COURT: How do you know how to do
14	that?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's a people sort of
16	job.
17	THE COURT: You can be a judge. Go ahead.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No children. College
19	degree. Never served on a jury. Never served on
20	a Grand Jury. No military. I have a few friends
21	who are officers.
22	THE COURT: What kind of work do they do,
23	if you know?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Couple of friends in
25	the 32nd Precinct and 28th Precinct.
	YVETTE PACHECO SENTOR COLUMN DEPONDED

<del>-</del>VOIR DIRE -

1	THE COURT: Every see of any of them as
2	you are walking around your neighborhood, see any
3	of your friends driving or walking by, in police
4	cars or plainclothes?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Do they wave or keep
7	themselves quiet?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
9	THE COURT: Some of them do drug
10	enforcement?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Do you call them about how
) 13	you should do your fund raising?
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
15	THE COURT: Do they ever call you about
16	how they should do their drug enforcement?
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
18	THE COURT: Continue.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think I have
20	any relatives who have been convicted of a crime.
21	I have been a party to lawsuit twice.
22	THE COURT: Is it over?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
24	THE COURT: During time it was going on,
25	were you deposed?
	YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT PEROPTER

T / A T D	$rac{1}{2}$
<del>-</del> ///	111 H
A O T I	17   1513

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Were you challenged?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kind of same way he
4	felt. I can be fair and impartial.
5	THE COURT: How long have you been a fund
6	raiser?
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About six years.
8	THE COURT: Thank you.
9	Mr. Antonio.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sorry, don't
11	understand.
12	THE COURT: I'm sorry you don't
13	understand. You can leave.
14	THE CLERK: Robert Sargenti.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was born in New
16	Jersey. I listed in New York for 12 years. I have
17	five relatives. I'm married. Two kids, three and
18	five. All we talk about is cough medicine. Those
19	are the only drugs we talk about.
20	THE COURT: Which one do they like?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They like cherry.
22	THE COURT: Grape was well when I left.
23	Go ahead.
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a self-employed
25	architect. My wife is a stay-at-home mom.
	VIETTE DACHECO SENTOD COURT DEPORTED

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

=VOIR DIRE =

Education, graduate degree. I have not been on --I've been on no jury. I have never been in the military. I have never been in the military. My cousin is a state cop who I haven't seen many, many years and a friend who is a policeman in New Jersey. He's, I don't know, just a regular small-town cop. I've been a victim of a crime, robbed at knifepoint. THE COURT: More than one person or one person? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: One person. I had my car stolen in New York.

> THE COURT: Something you arranged or did it just happen?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I definitely did not have it arranged.

> THE COURT: How long ago was that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Five, six years ago.

THE COURT: You can't be prosecuted if you had your car stolen because it's past the statute of limitations.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My brother was beaten in an altercation, severely hurt. It was college kids fighting, that kind of thing.

THE COURT: Was anybody arrested? =YVETTE PACHECO SENIOR COURT REPORTER =

7=	70	TI	D '	η.	Т 1	D.	_
— \	/\ )	'	Κ .	ı,	1 1	ĸ	н

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I've been in
2	lawsuits before, mostly architecture and
3	construction type of thing.
4	THE COURT: Questioned by the adversary's
5	attorneys?
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I have not. Not
7	in a formal sense. I live in the Upper East Side.
8	I can be fair and impartial.
9	THE COURT: Anything else we should know?
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
11	THE COURT: Ms. Crystal.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Born in Pittsburgh.
13	Lived in New York 40 years. I have about five
14	relatives in New York. I'm divorced. I am an
15	executive recruiter. I have two grown children.
16	College graduate. I served on New York City
17	criminal Grand Jury, narcotics division.
18	THE COURT: How long were you on that
19	Grand Jury?
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Exactly eight years
21	ago today, and get excused for eight years from
22	jury duty after.
23	THE COURT: Sounds like a memorable
24	experience. So you remember, I hope, I trust,
25	that you know your services at Grand Jury, that a